

The image shows the front cover of an old book. The spine is a plain, light brown material. The main cover is decorated with marbled paper featuring a pattern of dark brown, wavy, diagonal stripes. Overlaid on this pattern are numerous irregular, light tan or yellowish spots of varying sizes. Interspersed among the stripes and spots are thin, dark, branching lines, possibly representing veins of stone or a specific marbling technique. In the bottom left corner, there is a rectangular stamp in black ink that reads "PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY".

PRINCETON
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Digitized by 

original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

8
476

Library of



Princeton University.

Digitized by Google

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ
BUCHHANDLUNG
LEIPZIG

Alfred L...

PROFESSOR E. HORVATH PHIL. D.

MODERN HUNGARY

1660

1920



6/

Copyright of this First Edition
by the Magyar Külügyi Társaság. Buda-
pest, Hungary, 1923.

Copyright of the subsequent editions
reserved by the author.

Price : in Hungary Five Hundred
Crowns — in England Five Shillings —
in the United States One Dollar.

SOUTH EASTERN LIBRARY
I.

PROFESSOR E. HORVÁTH PHIL. D.:

MODERN HUNGARY

1660-1920

1 9 2 2

BUDAPEST, MAGYAR KÜLÜGYI TÁRSASÁG

M. Tud. Társulatok Sajtóvállalata Rt. Budapest, VIII, Múzeum-körút 6.

Nyomdaigazgató: Szabó T. István.

CHAPTER I.

Formation of the Dual Monarchy. 1660—1815.

I. Introduction.

1. The hereditary provinces of Austria originally consisted of Ostmark and Carantania, the Eastern bulwarks both of the Frankish and of the Holy Roman Empires, held by the Wittelsbach and Babenberg families. The last Babenberg being killed in 1246, Emperor Rudolph gave the duchy of Austria to his sons Albert and Rudolph Habsburg, the descendants of whom acquired also Carantania, (Karinthia), Kraina, Tyrol and Triest. By the fortunate marriages of the family they later inherited Bohemia, a dependent kingdom and electorate of the Holy Roman Empire, and Hungary, an independent kingdom, thus originating the *Gesamtmonarchie*, the dream of the later politicians of Austria.

The Kingdom of Hungary lost her national dynasty with Andrew III. in 1301, the Kingdom of Bohemia with Wenceslas III. in 1306, both countries thus becoming the heritage of the female branches of their national dynasties, and both kingdoms being subsequently acquired by the rulers of Austria.

Jun 12 1884 A. A. P. be. Hanaso 757.50 Ed.

In 1395 Sigismund of Luxemburg, King of Bohemia and consort of Mary, Queen of Hungary, became the ruler of both kingdoms, and as his daughter Elisabeth married Albert of Austria, an Archduke became the king of both Hungary and Bohemia in 1437.

Austria, Hungary and Bohemia had now for the first time a ruler in common, but there is no doubt that all three countries remained quite independent possessions of the same family. The Habsburg Emperor held his court at Vienna, and left his Czech and Hungarian possessions to their own fate. These, instead of accepting Albert's posthumous son, Ladislas, elected Albert of Bavaria to be King of Bohemia, and Vladislav of Poland, the grandson of Louis the Great of Hungary to be King of Hungary. The death of King Ladislas in 1457 dissolved the weak union of the Habsburg lands, which was only restored by Ferdinand I., the brother of Emperor Charles V. in 1526.

The Unions of 1437 and of 1526 had no resemblance to those of later times. The Archduke was absolute lord in Austria, a feudal King in Bohemia and a constitutional monarch in Hungary, of which last named kingdom he took the royal oath in 1527. As however Ferdinand I. and his descendants ruled from Vienna, their *Hofkanzlei*, *Hofkammer* and *Hofkriegsrat* extended the influence of the only Court over both Hungary and Bohemia, and so the personal ties soon involved closer relations between the various lands of the sole Ruler.

During the Wars of Religion the struggle never ceased between the Austrian Centralists and the national oppositions.

The Protestants of the German Empire, of Hungary and of Bohemia were backed by the Maritime Powers and formed the first alliance under the lead of Henri IV. and of Catholic France against the arbitral power of the Casa d'Austria. After the death of the Bourbon King the leadership descended to James I. of England, later on to Christian of Denmark, and Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, but as a result of the Thirty Years' War Bohemia being defeated in the battle of the White Mountain, she submitted herself unconditionally to Austria in 1620. The German Princes alone received sovereign rights by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, and Hungary remained, as she was, *de jure* an independent Kingdom with a free Parliament, and a responsible Government, the laws between 1608 and 1655 forming the first compacts, if not the first Compromise between the Lord of United Austria and Hungary.

In these laws the king acknowledged it his duty to reside in Hungary or to give the „*palatino futuro plenariam ac omnimodam potestatem, regnum istud cum consilio Hungarico, non secus, ac si ipsamet hic resideret plenarie ac omnimode more antiquitus solito, regendi ac administrandi.*“ (1608 XVIII. §. 1613. VII. §. 1618. IV. §.); to tender to the Parliament a report of his own revenues and the budget of the Realm (1625 XXVII. §. 1635 IX. 1638. X. §) and to pay all duties for his own estates: „*bona Suae Maiestatis ubique in Regno existentia iurisdictioni et oneribus subsint.*“

The first member of the Royal Council was the Palatine (*Palatinus Regni Hungariae*), whose office must be filled „*intra anni revolutionem*“, and if the King declined to do this, it was the duty and

„plenaria autoritas sub ommissione honoris et officiorum suorum“ of the Minister of Justice, the *Iudex Curiae Regiae*, and of the Treasurer, the *Magister Tavernicorum*, to fix the day of election (1608 III. §, 1618. XV. §).

The King governs only with his Hungarian Council (1608. X. §, 1613. XXV. §, 1618. VIII. §, 1622. XVII. §, and XXIV. §, 1635. XXVIII. §, 1649. VIII. §). He recognises the treaty right of the nation and sends a Hungarian Minister to assist the Imperial Ambassadors in the interest of the Realm (1630. XXXVI. §, 1635. XXVIII. §, 1638. III. §, 1647. LXXIV. §, 1649. VII. §).

Triennial Parliaments there were to be held (1635. XCIV. §, 1647. CLVI. §, 1655. XLIX. §), King and Parliament together only having the right to make laws: „leges et statuta condendi autoritas Regni et Regno sit libera, neque alia quemquam regnicolarum ligare debeant“ (1635. XVIII. §).

II. The national revival and its suppression 1660—1681.

2. The year 1660 proved one of the most important years in the annals of Europe.

The Habsburgs lost their long wielded control over the Continent, their enemies, the Maritime Powers, the Prussians, the Swedes, and the Turks fought victoriously for the balance of power in the German Empire and in the World; their last allies, the Poles and the Danes were isolated.

But the hopes of succession in both branches of the family were infinitely small, the Spanish branch consisting of a dying King, Felipe IV., and of a

feeble boy, Prince Carlos, and the Casa d'Austria consisting of two bishops — Leopold of Strassburg and Passau, and Sigismund of Augsburg and Trier — and of only one Prince, Leopold King of Hungary and Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. The young Emperor had married the sister of the boy Prince of Asturias, this being the last intermarriage between the two Houses.

On Charles and Leopold therefore were all the burdens of their vast dominions, which were surrounded by Portugal and France on the West, by the Confederation of the Rhine and by Savoy in the centre, by the Swedes and by the Turks on the East, and the struggle lasting half a century was soon begun by Cardinal Mazarin and his ambitious ally, the Grand Vizier Mohamed Koprili.

3. The Turk attacked his tributary Prince of Transylvania, who not long before had been defeated by the Poles in the Northern War and was left out of the treaties of his Swedish ally, signed in Oliva and in Copenhagen (1660). Prince George Rákóczi II. mortally wounded expired in the arms of his wife, Sophie Báthory at Nagyvárad, leaving the constitutional government of Hungary without the guarantee of the armed Principality and of its foreign allies.

Nagyvárad, the gate of Transylvania was shortly afterwards taken by the Turk, and the newly elected Prince John Kemény asked for the help of the King, at the same time forwarding his last tribute to Constantinople, and despatching his envoys to the Palatine and to the Court of Vienna.

The Palatine, Count Francis Wesselényi, an old man unfit for any great effort owing to rheumatism, was „fort zélé pour l'Empereur“, as the French Am

bassador wrote to his Sovereign,¹ but he was also equally touched by the ill fate of the Principality and identified himself with the requests of Kemény to the King.

Count Nicholas Zrinyi, the passionate Banus of Croatia and a member of the Royal Council, as Captain General of his provinces, did not wait for the Royal Proclamation, but crossed the frontier to open the war for the liberation of the Realm and for its new guarantees in the Principality (Transylvania).²

But the King influenced by his Austrian Ministers, the Dukes of Gonzaga and of Porcia, was for the abandonment and not for the rescue of the Prince of Transylvania, which would involve him in war on account of because his wretched Hungarian Counties. So he ordered back the Banus, instructed Count Souches, an emigrant Huguenot, to maintain the defence of the Austrian frontiers,³ and when at last he sent Count Raimondo Montecuccoli with a relief column to Transylvania, the General moved slowly down from the Austrian frontier, proceeded to Kolozsvár and returned in the same procession to Austria, without meeting with a single Turk

¹ A C P (MSM Vol. XIX. Zagreb 1888) Pag. 16.

² His work, the *Symbolum Illustrissimi Domini Comitiss Nicolai Zrinyi: Nemo me impune lacessit* (1660) was an appeal to the nation to take arms and to expel the Turks from Hungary. It went from hand to hand and was only published at Bartha in 1705, and by general Eugene Horváth "The military works of Count Nicholas Zrinyi" (Hung). Budapest 1888.

³ Instruction of Prince Porcia to General Count Souches, MTA Vol. V. Pag. 476.

The victorious Sirdar Ali now placed a noble of his own faction Michael Apaffy — on the throne, administered the oath and took the tribute for his Padishah, and defeated Prince Kemény near Nagyszöllős, where the leader of the union movement was killed in the battle.

Montecuccoli's raid (the „Transylvanian promenade“) caused general disaffection, and Count Zrinyi's attack — „Nos fallimur, tu philosophans“ — was greeted with unanimous approval.

The Banus at once proclaimed a state of war in his own Provinces, but the King again declared it a private enterprise and in the Peace of Temesvár he abandoned the restoration of Simon Kemény, son of the late Prince, and rejected the reunion of Hungary, Croatia, Transylvania (1662), the restoration of the old Hungarian Empire under the old Constitution and with an united Government.

Grand Vizier Ahmed Köprili now took an offensive campaign against King Leopold, crossed the Save near Belgrade, the Drave near Eszék, reached Buda without opposition, and with the capture of Érsekújvár laid open the road to Vienna in 1663.

Austria was seized with despair, and the King at last gave free hand to the Banus, who on his brilliant raid burnt the bridge of Eszék and was congratulated by the Pope and the kings of France and Spain, while Count Montecuccoli retreated to Austria, and the brave Croat and Magyar regiments fell in vain around the ruined walls of Zerinvár, a little fort built by Count Zrinyi against the Ottoman Invasion.

With the aid of a French Contingent sent by Louis XIV under La Feuillade and Coligny the Imperialists

at length won a definite victory on the Styrian frontier, but shortly after the battle of St. Gotthard the Imperial Ambassador Reniger von Reningen in the treaty of Vasvár, accepted the *status quo ante*, and left Zerinvár, Érsekújvár and Nagyvárád in the hand of the Turk, giving up definitely and in the name of the Emperor the liberation and reunion of the Realm (1664).

4. The Treaty of Vasvár (1664) was everywhere accepted „con disapprovazione universale e con dolore ed acerba passione” according the Venetian Ambassador of Vienna,¹ and there was a general cry for the repeal of the sham treaty of the Austrian *Centralists* by the *Parliament*.

As Parliament had not been held since 1662, it was the duty of the Palatine to ask for its repeal in the sense of the famous 1222. XXXI. §., but Count Wesselényi's petitions were put aside unanswered, and a revolutionary movement broke out against the foreign soldiers, ministers and diplomatists of the Court.

The growing opposition held only with one hand the fatal 1222. XXXI. §. so successful against a feeble King, but so risky against a mighty Emperor, whose troops held at once Hungary and Austria, Italy and the banks of the Rhine; the States therefore sought the protection of the King of France and of the Sultan, the ancient allies of the Principality.

The secret Cabinet of the Opposition was held at the French Embassy in Vienna, where Sieur de Crémonville received the desperate Banus and the Primate George Lippay, who by their dignities were

¹ FRA Diplomataria Vol. XXVII, Vienna 1867. Pag. 107.

sufficient to call the attention of Versailles to the malcontents and to make them useful in the partition of the Spanish Empire, King Felipe IV being now dead and his feeble son unlikely to reign long.

The Banus was shortly afterwards killed in the chase, Archbishop Lippay died, and the cautious Palatine remained in the centre of the movement, its pillars being now the new Banus, Count Peter Zrinyi in Croatia, Stephen Thököly, Count of Árva, in Upper Hungary, Francis Rákóczi, son of Prince George II and elected Prince of Transylvania, and Prince Apaffy, the ally of Louis XIV. and of the Turk.

Their first Covenant was signed at Stubnyafurdő (April 1666), where the Banus called upon the Palatine,¹ and it was duly forwarded to Grémonville. The first Conference of the malcontents was held in the Castle of Murány, on an estate of the Palatine, and was attended by an envoy of the Prince, who sent another envoy with that of the Hungarian *Interessati* to the Grand Vizier; the second Conference was held at the French Embassy; but the premature death of the Palatine in 1667 deprived the movement of its legal results.

5. The King left the affair (which was related to him by the Greek Panagiotes, the First Dragoman of the Porte) to his Austrian Premier, Count Wenceslas Lobkowitz, the son of Count Zdenko, the first Governor of the annexed Bohemian Province, who was ambitious to be a Minister of all the Habsburg Possessions, and thus the Court was not

¹ Published in A C P (MSM Vol XIX. Zagreb 1888). Page 259.

unprepared when the third Conference at Kassa voted for the insurrection in March 1670.

It was immediately followed by the invasion of the united forces of the Emperor.

General Spankau crossed the frontier of Croatia, while General Sporck invested Arva Castle, only to find the dead body of the old Count, and the Imperialists occupied the whole country except Transylvania.

Two thousand nobles and Protestant ministers were consigned to execution or to the Spanish galleys; others saved their lives by flight. The Banus, who rode to Vienna to obtain the pardon of the King, and his intimate friends, the Counts Frangepán and Nádasdy were beheaded in Austria, after trial by foreign judges in a foreign land; countess Catherine Frangepán lost her reason in a cloister at Graz; his son had his eyes put out in the prison of Kufstein; Baldassare Zrinyi died in prison; while John Anthony was enrolled, as „Anthon Gnade“, a common trooper in the Imperial Army; Francis Rakóczi alone was pardoned owing to his mother's munificence to the Church. The French protection of the *Interessati* proved also a failure, as Louis XIV, who wrote in 1666: „je puisse par le moyen des Hongrois lui (viz. to the Emperor) donner des affaires et des embarras dans ses propres pays“,¹ congratulated Prince Lobkowitz and sent him „un tres vil et sincere compliment sur les bons succes de la Hongrie“,² as the Partition Treaty of 1668 already guaranteed him a part of the Spanish Dominions.

¹ Ibid. Page 99.

² Ibid. Page 175.

Count Lobkowitz now submitted a Memorandum to King Leopold on the government of Hungary, which was „considerata dalla corte come hereditario dominio dopo la rebellione“,¹ there being no longer a Constitutional Government consisting of a Palatine, a Banus, an *Judex Curiae Regiae* and a *Magister Tabernicorum*, just as there had been since 1662 no triennial Parliament. The new Primate, Archbishop George Szelepchényi was weak enough to accept the lieutenantcy of all the Royal offices, acting „officio Palatinali, Judicatus Curiae, Banali vacante... durante beneplacito nostro.“

Croatia was declared an Austrian Province: „das Land Kroatien von der Muehr bis aufs Meer... von der ungarischen Krone separiert und euer kaiserlichen Majestät Erblichen unterthänig gemacht“,² and the Patent of 1673 established a new government of the Realm with four Hungarian and four German Councillors, with Caspar Johann Ampringen, Grandmaster of the German Knights at its head.³

The Governor happened to be an upright and courteous man, who would not associate himself with the cruelties of his Council, and as he courteously greeted Prince Apaffy of Transylvania, he lost his popularity in the Centralist Circles of the Court, while the policy of oppression was taken over by a member of the Council Count Leopold Kollo-

¹ Report of the Venetian Ambassador at Vienna, 1671. FRI. Diplomataria Vol. XXVII Vienna 1867 Page 153.

² MSM Vol. XVI. Page 338.

³ March 1673. Published by Stephen Katona: KHC. Vol. XXXIV. Buda 1804. Page 103-8.

nich, bishop of Nyitra, who spread „une haine incroyable pour le gouvernement allemand“ trough the Realm.¹

Transylvania alone retained her Independance.

She opened her gates to the *Interessati* — the intellectuals of the Revolution of 1670, from that time called the Kurucz Emigrants, the friends of the former Prince Kemény, who were invited to take the leading posts in the Principality, and one of them, Michael Teleki, a near relative of Prince Apalfy shortly afterwards became a powerful Minister of the State.

Thus the tables were turned against Austria.

The French on the West invaded Holland and Germany in 1672: the Ambassadors of Louis XIV. were in close contact with the Hungarian emissaries at Vienna and at Warsaw, and Count Teleki expelled the German garrisons from the Tisza district. The following year, 1673, Louis XIV. extended his alliance to Poland and Bavaria, and Prince Apalfy asked for the military help of King John Sobiesky. In 1674 the French occupied Flanders and Franche Comté; in 1675 the treaty of Warsaw formed an alliance between the French and the Poles, that of Fogaras between the French, the Poles and Transylvania,² to make them useful for the French projects: „soustenus d'embarrasser l'empereur et faire une diversion considérable de toutes ses forces“. In 1676 Count Teleki led a second expedition to

¹ MJC Vol. XII. Innsbruck 1891. Page 288.

² It was made by Count Thököly and Teleki and in the name of Louis XIV. and of John III. of Poland.

³ EOE. Vol. XVII. Budapest 1894. Page 249.

Hungary, and in 1677 his Prince made a second alliance with Louis XIV. at Warsaw, the King of France being obliged to give 100.000 *thalers* and the Prince to form an army of 15.000 men.

At that time the leader of the *Kurucz* emigrants, Count Imre Thököly, the popular son of the Count of Árva, was vigorously backed by his home Counties in Upper Hungary, where the insurgents desired an expedition far more energetic than Teleki's manoeuvres. The transactions of Nijmegen (1678), and the lack of French and Polish cooperation however resulted in anarchy under the insurgents; the envoy of Transylvania met with a cold reception at Versailles „Colbert eat semper Colbert”,¹ that of Thököly found only the „consolation de l'espérance d'une si puissante protection”,² and so the united forces started without any hope of victory on their last expedition in 1678.

Both leaders reached Kassa in June, but Count Teleki returned to Transylvania. Count Thököly, a charming youth of 22 alone bearing aloft the standard of Independence, sweeping at the head of his cavalry the German garrisons of Upper Hungary, and maintaining the lost cause during the next two years while the Powers made peace in 1679, and Louis XIV. the „supremus defensor ac patronus oppressorum”³ ordered, that „le S.eur Marquis de Vitry se contentera de les (Hongrois) assurer en paroles générales de l'affection du Roy”.⁴

¹ TT. Vol. VI. Budapest 1883. Page 47.

² TT. Vol. IX, Budapest 1889 Page 336

³ Ibid. Vol. XI. Budapest, 1886. Page 505.

⁴ 1679. R. J. F. Vol. I. Paris 1885. Page 75

III. The Nationalities, a new factor in Hungarian Politics.

6. In recording the question of Nationalities in the first twenty years of the period which saw the Habsburgs lay the bases of their rule — instead of Germany, which became a land of independent Princes and Towns by the Treaty of Westphalia, — in Hungary and Austria: we have to investigate the origin and constitutional position of the two great races and the two great civilisations those of the Croats on the Adriatic and of the Roumanians in Transylvania, both peoples living under Hungarian domination, and through the intrigues of the Vienna Government both becoming rivals and enemies of the Magyars.

In the early Middle Ages (641—1102) the Croats formed a separate state, but Croatia comprised only the territory between the rivers Cetina and Bojana, between the village of Cetin and the town of Dulcigno on the Adriatic Shore, as far North as the Save.¹ Between the Save and the Drave rivers lay Slavonia, the inhabitants of which were not Croats, but Slovenes, the old Slav population of Western Hungary. It was the Turkish Conquest, which forced the Christian population to leave the Balkan Peninsula and to move northwards, and so in the XVth and XVIth Centuries the Croats, Servians and Albanians crossed the Save and appeared on Hungarian soil. After the battle of Mohács in 1526, a new population settled in Slavonia, and a new

¹ Ferdo Szisch: Geschichte der Kroaten. Vol. I. Zagreb. 1917. Pp. 58—59.

7 | nobility took over the government of Croatia-
1 | Slavonia, where the Sabor of 1492 in its address
3 | confessed that „Coronae ei Regno subiecti sumus”,
5 | but another Sabor held ad Cetin, in the Castle of
7 | the Frangepans on new Year's Day, 1527. elected
9 | — in the presence of his German commissioners —
11 | a separate king in the person of Archduke Ferdinand,
13 | on the ground that Croatia came „libero arbitrio”
15 | under the Crown of St. Stephen. Croatia-Slavonia
17 | was now divided between the military districts of
19 | Varasd and Karlovac, dependent on the Imperial Military
21 | Councils at Graz and Vienna, and between
23 | the Banus, a member of the Hungarian Government.
25 | The parts of old Croatia (Croatia-Dalmatia) and the
27 | newly acquired Slavonia were for the first time united
29 | by the historian John Luchich (Johannes Lucius)
31 | in his valuable history (De regno Dalmatiae et
33 | Croatiae. Amsterdam 1666), which became the basis
35 | of all Croatian histories and political theories.

1 | It was Count Nicholas Zrnyi, who in his Turkish
3 | Afium reunited both Croats and Magyars against
5 | the common enemy. Their heroic struggle however
7 | was always counteracted by the Ministers of Austria,
9 | who preferred a shameful peace with the Turk to a
11 | victorious Croato-Magyar Union dangerous to Austrian
13 | domination, and so after the revolution of 1670
15 | Croatia was separated from Hungary. It was General
17 | Count Joseph Herberstein who occupied Croatia-
19 | Slavonia from the Drave to the Adriatic, and who
21 | elaborated a separate Constitution for the Croats
23 | „das land Kroatien nebst der Insul von der Muehr
25 | an, bis aufs Meer Buccari, von der ungarischen
27 | Krone separiert und euer Kaiserlichen Majestät
29 | Erblichen unterthanig gemacht, zu dem Ende auch

unverzüglich ein authorisierter commissarius dahin in das land verordnet und abgeschickt wurde, — I. § ein von euer Kaiserlichen Majestät immediate bestellter Vice-Ban oder Landsverweser, II. § zwei Geistlichen aus dem Kapitel, zwei Herren Stände und zwei Richter Landssubjekte als Landesrath,“ IV. § a Commanding General.¹

The Roumanians are certainly of Italian extraction, but „throughout the early Middle Ages the bulk of the Roman population lay south of the Danube. It was in the Balkan lands, that the Roumanian race and language took their characteristic mould. It is there that this new Illyrian Romance first rises into historic prominence. Byzantium applied to them the name of Vlach and we find a series of political organisations and territorial divisions connected with the name of Vlachia: — Great Wallachia (in Thessaly), Little Walachia (in Aitolia or Acarnania) the Maurovlachs (Morlachs) on the Adriatic Shore“.² The Vlachs appeared in the Balkan valleys in the XIIIth Century and founded there a Bulgaro-Vlach Empire, from Bulgaria they crossed the Danube and the Carpathians and appeared in Transylvania, where they are first mentioned in a document of 1222. At that time the Roumanian language was not introduced into the Church and all service books were in Slavonic. Their bishop, Sava Brancovich (till 1680) was a Serb, his successor a Greek, Greeks and Servians being then the leading elements of the Eastern Church. The Princes of Transylvania wished to emancipate their

¹ M S M Vol. XVI. Page 338.

² Vlachs. E. B. Edition XI. Vol. XXVIII Cambridge 1911. Pp. 166—68.

Roumanian subjects from the Graeco-Servian predominance, but it was rather a Calvinistic reformation, and it was for this that Prince George I. Rákóczi founded a Roumanian Press and a Roumanian school at Gyulafehérvár in 1638, where he published a Roumanian translation of the Bible in 1644, and a Roumanian Catechism in 1648. In this way the Roumanian population received back the use of the Roumanian in the Church and came into touch with the Latin, as the Patent of 1692 ordered that the Roumanian priest „I. § vernacula praed.cabit, . . . XVI. § scholae ubi fieri potest inter Valachos erigantur, in quibus primum lectionem et scriptionem linguam ac literis Valachias iuniores strenuo doceantur, adhibita deinde, ubi commode fieri potest, Latinae linguae cultura.”

After the fall of the Principality Bishop Athanasius when being consecrated at Bucarest in 1697, was instructed by Patriarch Dosithius to introduce the Graeco-Slav liturgy, but in Transylvania he was already confronted with the Austrian influence, which finally led him to Union with Rome.

It was in that critical period of 1690—1700 that the Nationalities of Hungary appeared as the supporters of the Austrian government and as the counterbalance of the Magyars, who refused to acknowledge as a consequence of the Turkish domination the immigration of the Croats, Serbs and Roumains, the advance of the newcomers towards the great Hungarian plain, and the necessity of restoring the County Government on a new model, including the new settlers in the frame of the old

¹ EOE, Vol. XVIII. Budapest 1895. Page 487 88.

Constitution. We called them „new settlers“ because their wandering had its milestones and a detailed chronology even in historical sources, as none of them happened to revive historic rights or to dream about reconquest of any part of the lands of St. Stephen, which from 895 onwards formed a state independent either of the Western or of the Eastern Roman Empires, or of the Slavonic formations of Bohemia, Poland and Russia.¹

IV. Liberation from the Turks and annexation by Austria 1681–1700.

7. The year 1681 proved another turning point in European history.

Louis XIV. appointed his *chambres de réunion*, took Strassburg by force and built up the *barrière d'Est* against the Habsburgs, by his alliances with Poland, Sweden and the Ottoman Porte. The haughty Grand Vizier ordered the suzerain Princes of the Porte in both Hungary and Transylvania to join the Sirdar Hassan, Pasha of Nagyvárad, and the *Kurucz* malcontents had never a better chance to liberate Hungary from the Austrian *Centralists*, who had destroyed the freedom of Hungary and at the same time left Prussia, the mightiest ally of the Emperor, out of the treaty of Nijmegen (1678) and made the Great Elector an ally of the French.

¹ Between 1473 and 1711 there have been published in Hungary, about 3000 works in foreign languages as against about 2000 Magyar publications, and of them about one half were published in Latin, the other half in German, Slovak, Croat and Roumanian.

But it was King Leopold, who being forced to ask for the help of Hungary against a Franco-Russian and a Turkish Invasion, at last restored the Constitution, the triennial Parliament and the old government of the Realm.

He happened to find many friends in the Parliament held at Sopron, the „remedium in extremis“, as the assembly was styled in the preamble of its Acts, — where he assured full amnesty for those implicated in the Revolution of 1670; he dissolved the *Gubernium* of 1673 (1681, II. §), restored the Palatinate (1681, I. §), the offices of the Treasurer (1681, XIV. §) and that of the Banus of Croatia (1681, LXVI. §), Count Thököly however, who did not accept the invitation for his Northern Counties, and preferred his personal sovereignty to a Compromise between King and Nation, was left out of the Acts, his alliance with the French and the Turk involving a great failure for him and to the interests of Hungary.

8. King and Nation now waited together for the Turk.

As Thököly and Prince Apaffy joined the Sirdar only in the autumn (1681), Hassan Pasha was unable to open the campaign against the King.

Next spring Thököly joined the Sirdar Ibrahim, Pasha of Buda, occupied Upper Hungary and was proclaimed King of the Counties ruled by his *Kurucz* garrisons.

Early in 1683 the newly elected Palatine, Count Paul Esterházy, a pupil of Count Nicholas Zrinyi, advised an offensive campaign and called for a General insurrection of the States, which assembled in the camp of Köpcsény, but the supreme command was given to the King's brother-in-law, Charles, Duke

of Lorraine and Bar, with the order to defend the frontiers of Austria

Meanwhile Grand Vizier Köprili Mustafa crossed the Save near Belgrad and the Drave near Eszék, where he was received by his humble servant Thököly, Prince of Upper Hungary, and moved on Vienna, which was invested by him in the summer.

The situation became so imminent, that the Court fled to Linz and the Palatine joined the Imperialists, while Thököly at Pozsony and Appaffy at Komárom formed large reserves for the Turk, and they impatiently awaited the victory of the Sultan which was to give them possession of the few Counties of the King

But Prince Charles by his masterful strategy took Pozsony and cut off the Princes from the immense army of the Grand Vizier, Thököly being thrown back to the Morava and Appaffy returning to Transylvania. The former turned now to John Sobiesky, but the King of the Poles was at this time an ally of King Leopold, and he left to his own fate the uncrowned ruler of Upper Hungary, whose revolting Counties accepted the King's offer of amnesty.

9. The Court, at the request of Marquis Borgomero, the Ambassador of Charles II, offered the Turk as cheap a peace as that of 1664, but Pope Innocent XI., Prince Charles and the Palatine turned the fate of the Habsburgs from the West to the East. The „fort réglé et fort simple“ King Leopold accepted as a whole the traditions of his Hungarian ancestors, and at the same time he issued his Royal manifest — to Transylvania, in which he asked the Transylvanians to take arms and stand shoulder to shoulder in the struggle for the liberties of the Realm,

— to Dalmatia, in which he took under his Royal protection the Republic of Ragusa „Eo modo, quo eadem sub gloriosis suis praedecessoribus, regibus Hungariae, antiquitus fuit stetitque“;¹ to „omnibus populis per universam Albaniam, Serviam, Mysiam, Bulgariam, Sisltram, Illynam, Macedoniam, Rasciam aliasque provincias a Regno nostro Hungariae dependentes, omnesque alios populos sub iugo Turcico gementes“, to join his army against the common enemy,² and as King of Hungary he at the same time protested against the Polish annexation of Moldavia.³

The relief of Vienna and the advance of the Imperial and Royal forces in Hungary therefore involved the decisive struggle with the Turks, but it culminated in the undesired Treaty of Karlóca (1699),⁴ forced upon King Leopold by the Spanish affairs, as the Counties between the Danube, the Tisza and the Maros remained in the hands of the infidels.

The first result of the liberation was the co-operation of Hungary, Croatia and Transylvania under

¹ G. R. Pp. 686-89.

² 6. April 1690. Published by Kerchelich. KC. Pp. 434-35 and by Katona: KHC Vol. XXXV Buda 1804. Pp. 655-58. Cf. L. Szalay op. cit. 22-25.

³ „ad vindicandas postliminia Hungariae Regno ad illud ab antiquo spectantes ditones, non deerit Sua Maiestas Caesarea auctoritati et partibus suis, ut in proximis Regni Hungariae Comitibus Statuum Consensus pro parte Suae Maiestatis Regae et Reipublicae ad plenum eius Provinciam Dominium accedant, ea tamen lege, ut Suae Caesareae Maiestati in Valachiam jus stet inconcussum.“ Baron Hurmuzaki. Documente, Vol. V. 1. Bucarest 1885. Pag. 355.

⁴ Published by ME.

the King, thus extending the military operations to Dalmatia, Bosnia, Servia, Wallachia and Moldavia.

The second consequence was the gratitude of the Parliament of 1687, which elected and crowned the young Prince Joseph, accepted the succession of the Habsburg family in the male line, and struck out the fatal 1222, XXXI. §, of the Fundamental Laws of the country.¹

The third consequence was the fall of Prince Thököly, whose Counties all accepted the King's amnesty and the Prince was deported to Belgrade by the angry Turk.

The fourth was the annexation of Transylvania, which was handed over by Count Teleki in the Treaty of Kercheshora in 1685, under the condition of „venia, condonatio, remissio, amnestia omnium“, the Principality being occupied by a force of 27.000 Germans and formally annexed after the Treaty of Balázsfalva (27. October 1687),² when the Transylvanian Diet broke off diplomatic relations with the Porte. On 31 December 1691 the (Magyars, Székely and Saxon) Estates received a Charter of their privileges in the *Diploma Leopoldinum*,³ while Michael Apaffy II., the elected Prince was interned to Vienna,

¹For particulars cf. Stephen Csekey's valuable book, *The Succession Right in Hungary*. Budapest 1917. Pp. 106-157. Count Frederick Ulrich Kinsky advised that since Hungary was now conquered with arms, the King could impose laws upon her according his pleasure. (Ibid. Pag. 113.)

² EOE. Vol. XVIII Budapest, 1895. Pp. 329-31

³ Sz. S., Page 24.

⁴ Sz. S. and ME. Pp. 577-95.

and after the Treaty of Karlóca forced to abdicate. The new Province was not united with Hungary; it received a Governor and a Gubernium and a separate Chancellery at the Vienna Court.

But it was a fifth and drastic consequence of the War of Liberation that the Royal Forces were disbanded and the Imperial Army was divided to form the garrisons of Hungary, Croatia and Transylvania. The Parliament of 1681 however restored the Constitution and the Hungarian element in the army became dominant, as the Venetian Ambassador reported that the Austrians, „non potendosi guerreggiare col Turco che non la spada degl'Ongari“.¹

The Imperial forces were of course stronger than the unarmed people and their government, and the Country was soon governed by the Austrian *Hofkriegsrat* „that office which has usually the direction of what concerns Hungary, which is reported as a conquered kingdom“, related Stepney, the British Ambassador at the Court of Vienna,² the Treaty of Karlóca being turned into a Charter of Conquest by the „furentes Aulici“, as the Austrian Centralists were styled by Archbishop Széchenyi.

The petitions of the Palatine were rejected by the Ministers of the Court; Bishop Kollonich, the hated leader of the late Gubernium was to issue new plans for the reconstruction of Hungary and the author of the „*Einrichtungswerk des Königreiches Ungarn*“ recommended the suspension of the Constitution, the tearing up of the Compromise of 1681, and to the introduction of ruthless despotism.

FRA. Diplomataria. Vol XXVII Vienna 1867 Page 23

² AR. Foreign-Affairs. Vol. II. Budapest 1877. Page 115.

Both Hungary and Transylvania were divided into military districts, governed by Austrian Generals — „von Teutschen beherrscht“, as it was pointed out in General Caraffa's Project of 1690 — under an „absoluter römisch-kaiserlicher Dominat.“¹

The Parliament of Hungary and the Diet of Transylvania were dissolved.

The seat of the Government was that of the Chancelleries of the Austrian Court at Vienna.

The leading families of the „insurgents“ were deprived of their estates, which were distributed among Austrian officers and settlers.

The Tisza district with its pure Magyar population was sold to the German Knights, while the Southern Counties were divided into military zones of Croats, Servians and Roumanians, — who unfortunately were not mentioned in the *Diploma Leopoldinum*, which remained therefore the Charter of the privileged Classes — the nationalities having been upheld as the guarantee of Austrian rule, under Austrian officers and against the disarmed rulers of the Realm.

The northern Counties of Croatia were in 1695 incorporated with Styria, and the Adriatic Shore was sold to the Austrian *Hofkammer*, which took possession of it under „titulo emptionis“.²

The immigrant Serbs of Old Serbia, about 200.000 under Arsenije Chernovich and the Patriarch of Ipek, received autonomy both ecclesiastical and political, and were furnished with arms by the *Hofkriegsrat*,

AVSL. Vol. I Nagyszeben 1853. Pag. 162.

² MGS. Vol. VI Budapest 1896. Pag. 258

forming a separate Servian state in the County of Bács.¹

The Servians of Croatia entered into communion with Rome and their bishop was nominated „*erga propositionem Consilii Aulici Bellici*“.² the bishop of the Roumanians in Transylvania was taken under the protection of the same *Hofkriegsrath*. „*Sua Maiestas Caesarea*“ having to give the „*Unionis defensionem Excellentissimo Commendanti*“.³ which caused a strong protest on behalf of the Greek Patriarch Dositheus, and of Sir William Paget, British Ambassador at the Porte, on behalf of the Catholics of Transylvania, but the new order was strongly supported by the Roumanians excluded from the Diploma Leopoldinum of 1691. „So long as they were spiritually united with the other Orthodox nations, and so long as they used the Slavonic or Cynilic alfabet, they would practically be cut off from the latin West“,⁴ but since union with Rome they had found the first trace of their Italian origin and favoured Latinisation

It was the highest desire of the Austrian Centralists, to crown the annexation of Hungary by the vote of the estates of the Realm, and the Nobles and Prelates were summoned to Vienna to give their sanction in the splendour of the imperial Court. But they declared on both occasions (in 1696 and 1698) that they had no power to vote anything, as they

¹ Charter of 1691. Published by Sz. Sz. Pp. 129-33 and ME. Pp. 597-99.

² NK. Innsbruck 1885. Page 749.

³ Ibid. Page 277.

⁴ EB. Vol. XXIII. Cambridge 1911. Pp. 845—47

were on foreign soil and did not form a legal Parliament, and the invitations were not renewed only because the news from Paris and Madrid turned the attention of the King, who hurried to make terms with the Turks, to leave the „tyrannies, dont les Turcs memes ne sont pas capable“,¹ and to let fall the whole system of the *Einrichtungswerk* of Bishop Kollonich, a castle built upon the sand.

V. *The first War of Independence and the first
Compromise with Austria 1701-1715.*

11 The death of Don Carlos II, was perhaps the most prominent event in the later history of Europe, as it was followed by the Union of France and Spain and by an opposition equally strong in Europe, India and America; by a general war, which was renewed many times and resulted in the fall of the Franco-Spanish Colonial System and in the formation of an European System of Powers.

At the parting of the ways Louis XIV, seemed to stand alone for his Spanish ambitions, while the Maritime Powers stood side by side with the fortunate Emperor, whose two sons were to inherit all Habsburg possessions.

The Elector of Prussia, who was asked by the Austrian Centralists to abdicate from his dominions in Silesia, was satisfied with a Royal title, and his country remained neutral between France and her allies, the Elector of Bavaria and the Polish Pretender Stanislas Leszczyński.

It was therefore a great mistake that Francis

¹ RHD, Vol. III. Paris 1889. Page 404.

Rákóczi II. the grandson of Prince George Rákóczi II. and of Count Peter Zrinyi and a stepson of Thököly, while holding in his hand the banner of his oppressed country, staked all his ambitions in the French Alliance, and asked Louis XIV. to be again the „supremus defensor ac patronus oppressorum”. His standards bore the bold words: *Pro Patria et Libertate!*¹ but they were soon overshadowed by the egoist likes of the Bourbons.

12. The Hungarian nation arose as one man: „both chiefs and people were cemented like a wall and seemed resolved to stand or fall together”² and as shortly afterwards Rákóczi commanded both Kingdom and Principality, Queen Anne of England asked King Leopold for a Compromise with the powerful Insurrection,³ in order to turn the Imperial forces from the Danube to the Rhine.

The King sent the Archbishop of Kalocsa, Paul Széchenyi to the Prince, and the Conference of Gyöngyös resulted in a new project of Compromise between Hungary and Austria. It was agreed that the King should accept as a whole, the Compromise of 1681; to dissolve the illegal Imperial Commission of Bishop Kollonich, now Primate of the Realm; to dissolve the military districts and to replace them by the Civil government, but Rákóczi sought the restoration of the elective kingdom and of the 1222.

¹ His manifest of 1703 was published separately and KHC. Vol. XXXVI. Buda 1805 Pp. 287—301, by ME. Pp. 601—11.

² Foreign Affairs. Vol. I. Budapest 1877. Page 611.

³ 1704. Ibid. Vol. I. Page 131 and 220. Instructions to George Stepney

XXXI. §. a demand contrary to the 1688 II. and III. §§; and to place the new Compromise under the guarantee of the Maritime Powers, and of Sweden and Poland, the then and former allies of the Magyar opposition.

The battle of Blenheim disappointed the hopes of taking Vienna by French and Bavarians on the West and by Rákóczi on the East, and the Maritime Powers again intervened to free the forces of the Emperor in Hungary and to turn them against the French.

At the second Conference of Gyöngyös, at the third of Selmecz and at the fourth of Nagyszombat (1705—6) Rákóczi — since July 1704 a Prince of Transylvania and since September 1705 a Prince of Hungary — added the souverain possession of Transylvania to his demands, which were rejected by Count Wenceslas Wratislaw, the Chancellor of Bohemia and Plenipotentiary of the young King Joseph I, and thus the last effort of the Maritime Powers, which sent Stepney and the Earl of Sunderland, Count Rechteren and Hamel-Bruyninx to Nagyszombat, remained fruitless. „Sire” the parting Stepney addressed King Joseph, — „Nous osons meme assurer Votre Majesté Imperiale, que moyennant une petite prolongation et quelques expediens modérés, Votre Majesté Impériale aurait eu le royaume de Hongrie et le principauté de Transylvanie dans une plus grande felicité et autorité plus ample que jamais ce royaume et cette province n'ont été possédés par aucun de vos ancetres. Mais, Sire, les représentants des généraux et des ministres nous ont ravi de cette affaire si important et présentement il ne nous reste autre chose qu'a

faire des vœux que les armes de Votre Majesté soient plus heureuses que nous soins n'ont été".¹

Prince Rákóczi was now at the height of his power, and at the Congress of Rozsnyó he presented the letters of Louis XIV. of France, which proposed to him an alliance recognizing his souverain Principality, and this project being rejected by the Court, the Prince proceeded to Marosvásárhely, where on 21st April 1707 he was invested with the hereditary dignity of Prince of Transylvania, and to Ónod where on 13th June the Habsburgs were deposed and the Prince of Transylvania was proclaimed the hereditary Prince of Hungary.

13. The French Ambassador, Des Alleurs was present, but the alliance with his King remained, as it ever was, the mere desire of the Prince. It was in vain that Rakóczi now united both Hungary and Transylvania in his own hands, because the Cromwellian Union was negatived by the crowned king, the legitimate king in the eyes of many: by his Palatinal Government, and by the Loyalists of both Hungary and Croatia, where a new Banus, Count John Pálffy organised the loyal forces and led them against the Prince.

The manifests of Palatine Prince Esterházy, of the Prelates and of the Counties of the Realm was a matter of great concern, but the Memorandum of the agent, Vetésy on the same day — 29th July 1707 — demonstrated also the vanity of the French Alliance.²

In his embarrassment King Joseph, the newly

¹ Ib.d. Vol. III. Budapest 1877. PAg. 182.

² FRA Diplomataria. Vol IX. Vienna 1855. Pp 58—60.

crowned king of Hungary opened the last campaign against the Prince, who on the 15th September turned to the East and made a treaty of alliance — through Prince Dolgorukij and Count Golovkin — with a new Power, with Peter the Great, the Tsar of Russia.¹

It was at this time that the commander in chief of the Imperial forces, Count Rabutin-Bussy, started, on the 6th August, from Vienna, and occupied Transylvania, while Guido Starhemberg held the line of the Danube.

Next year on the 3th August 1708, General Heister reported a victory over the Insurgents near Trencsén and as it was preceded by the battles of Oudenarde on the 11th July and by Golovczyn on the 15th July, it proved a general defeat for the Franco-Russian-Magyar coalition.

Louis XIV was now further than ever from a junction with the Kurucz Insurgents, and the transactions of Ukraintsev and Prince Kurakin, the Russian Envoys at the Court of Rakóczi, remained also fruitless. The Prince was advised about secret negotiations between Peter the Great and King Joseph against Charles XII. the victorious king of the Swedes, and from Russia he turned to England and Prussia for a mediation at the Vienna Court,² but their overtures were rejected by the Imperial Government.³

He turned now to the Hague, but when the

¹ Published by Joseph Fiedler *ib.* Page 308, and by Alexander Márki *op. cit.* Page 89.

² A R. Foreign Affairs, Vol. III. Budapest 1877. Page 406

³ *Ibid.* Vol. II. Budapest 1877. Page 361.

interviews of the Duke of Marlborough and the Marquis de Torcy were interrupted, the agent Vetésy was advised by the latter to resume the military operations against Austria, 'the instruction of the Prince to his envoys at the Hague being therefore a belated attempt to obtain the mediation of Prussia for the recognition of the Principality.'

The Counties and the army were exhausted in the continuous war, and the isolated Prince wrote on the same day to Prince Leopold Lamberg, the chief Minister at the Vienna Court, to the Ambassadors of the Maritime Powers and to the Tsar for their mediation,¹ this being the only chance after Malplaquet and Poltava (9th July and 11th September 1709), but he was left out of the League cemented between Russia, Poland and Denmark, which at the same time destroyed the hopes of Charles XII, of Rákóczi and of the Turk.

14. The insurrection became now step-by-step an isolated chapter of the War of the Spanish Succession and also of the Northern Wars.

The only answer received from Vienna was that the Prince should appear before the Parliament. He however once more resolved on a general attack and after its failure he retreated towards the Carpathians, while the country was occupied by the Loyalist Army of the Banus of Croatia. Count Pálffy asked the Prince to interrupt his foreign relations and to accept the amnesty of the King, but Rákóczi

¹ 4 June 1709, F R A Diplomataria. ol. IX, Vienna 1855, Page 133.

² 8 July 1709. Ibid. Vol XVII, Vienna, 1858, Page 52.

³ 29 July 1709. Ibid. Page 66.

on 30 th August 1710 once more turned to Queen Anne of England: „Madame, Nous ne demandons ny armes, ny troupes, ny forces, ny prolongation de la guerre; nous ne souhaitons de Hauts allés qu'une charité chrétienne et mutuelle que l'on doit avoir selon les loix divines et humains pour tous ceux qui sont persecutés par l'ambition, la cruauté et l'avarice d'une force supéneure. Nous paroissions Madame devant le flambeau ardent de la liberté de votre heureux Royaume avec une chandelle esteinte, mais encore fumante, sera-t-il possible qu'une Reine et une nation aujourdhuy aussi élevée, que la notre est abatus, ne veuille allumer cette chandelle au flambeau de sa liberté?"¹ Queen Anne intervened on 5 th September² and Saint John was commanded to instruct Ambassador Palmes to „press the Imperial Court with the utmost earnestness. The Queen thinks it impossible by force alone to put an end to the troubles in Hungary. Being a people used to liberty, violence and oppression will never subdue them to be quiet under the Austrian Government, but they may easily be won by indulgence and rendered faithful subjects by restoring them to their just privileges.”³

Prince Rákóczi did not submit himself to the Habsburg king, but on the same way left for Poland, where at the head of his troops he first crossed the Carpathians and died in exile. He cleared the way

¹ Ibid. Pp. 126—28

² Kensington Queen Anne to Emperor Joseph. AR Foreign Affairs. Vol. III. Budapest 1877. Pp. 456—58.

³ 30. January 1711. Whitehall. Saint John to Palmes. Ibid. Pp. 477—78.

for the understanding, which was made on 1st May 1711 by Count John Pálffy on behalf of the (now deceased) King and Alexander Károlyi on behalf of the Insurgents in the 'Treaty of Szatmár,' the whole army and all the Counties accepting the amnesty of the King. Two weeks later Rákóczi declared it an act of disloyalty, but his protest of 13th May 1711 did not change or even prevent the definite Compromise made at the Parliament of 1712—15, between King Charles III and the Nation.

The Compromise of 1715 presented a very interesting similarity to that of 1867, the common basis of both Acts being the constitutional independence of Hungary (1715, III. §) and its close alliance with the other provinces of the King, common defence (1715, VIII. §) and common foreign affairs (1715, XLI. §), the later provisions amounting to, as they really resulted in, an Austrian hegemony over Hungary, Croatia and Transylvania: the Dualism of the *ancien régime*.

VI. *The first Century of the Dualism 1715-1815.*

15. The treaties from Szatmár to Madrid (1711-15) proved a definite settlement of all vital questions of Western and Central Europe.

They united France and Spain under the Bourbon lilies and freed both Powers from their expensive war on Belgian soil; they created in Holland a powerful barrier against the arbitrary power of Louis XIV., who died broken hearted, and left his country an easy prey of the coming Revolution, while

¹ Published by ME Pp. 623—32.

England became a first rank power in Europe, outside of which she obtained immense territories.

Russia played henceforth an important rôle on the Baltic, on the frontiers of Poland and of Turkey, at the same time claiming a road to the warm Seas of the West and of the South.

Central Europe was divided between Prussia, which acquired Stettin and came into possession of certain territories on the Rhine; between Austria, which commanded Bohemia in the North and Lombardy in the South; and between Hungary, which consisted of the Motherland, of Croatia, Slavonia, Transylvania, and since the Treaty of Pozarevac in 1719 of the now so called „Banat“, and thus *de jure* she was in full possession of the whole territory between Pozsony and the Iron Gate, between the Adriatic and the South Eastern Carpathians; in Croatia-Slavonia and in Transylvania however new provinces have been formed, while the liberated Counties in the South were separated from the Motherland, and formed another Province under military rule. It was advised by Prince Eugene of Savoy: „Bei der unveränderlichen meinung dass weder die gegenwärtige noch künftige Friedensumstände die incorporierung mit Ungarn wohl aber die Arth einer abgesonderten Provinz wie Siebenbürgen cum reservatione Domini supremi territorialis . . . zu J. K. M. Dienst einrathen können.“¹ and this was the origin of the so-called „Banat“, which had never a Ban, while the suppressed old Counties of which never formed a separate Province.

¹ 21 June 1717. A. Arneth: Prinz Eugen von Savoyen. Vol. II, 1708-18. Vienna, 1858. Page 529.

The other weakness of the Habsburg dominions lay at Vienna, where the Centralism of Count Lobkowitz was received and turned at the same time against Prussian ascendancy and Hungarian independence.

The Spanish faction at Court sought to build up an Austrian Empire on the Adriatic, on the Neapolitan shores and in Belgium, while the German Circle attacked Prussia on the North and advocated the incorporation of Hungary on the East. From 1711 to 1719 the Archbishop of Valencia, Don Antonio Felch y Cardona and Michael Althan intrigued against each other at the head of the two factions. After their death both groups were united by Prince Eugene of Savoy, but next year he took over the governorship of Belgium and Lombardy, and he was left out of the Cabinet of the Emperor.

16. The Prince was the ablest man at Court, but the antagonism created by his *Ostend Company*, a formidable rival of the East India Company, involved the Hanoverian League of England and Prussia in 1725 and rendered impossible the smooth acceptance by the Western Powers of the *Pragmatic Sanction*, the nucleus, if not a new form of the Austrian *Gesamtmonarchie*.

The document announcing the individuality of all the Habsburg lands was drawn up by the German John Bartenstein, the clerk of the Vienna Cabinet, and it was duly accepted by the hereditary Provinces of Austria, and with the approbation of the Constitutional Government, by the States of Hungary-Croatia (1723, I. III. §§) and also by Transylvania,¹

¹ For particulars cf. Csekey op. cit. Pp. 163-279. It is important to quote here the Report of the Prussian Am-

but the foreign guarantees of the House Law caused European difficulties.

Walpole accepted it on condition that the *Ostend Company* were suppressed; that Lorrain, the possession of Duke Francis of Lorrain and Teschen, husband of the last Habsburg, the infant Archduchess Maria Theresa were annexed by Louis XV. of France, and that Sicily were reunited with the Spanish Crown. The Imperialist forces being defeated, Emperor Charles VI. and the Duke of Lorrain lost the above named dominions.

The ambitions of the Vienna Court were now supported by the Russian alliance of 6th August 1726, but the combination proved another failure by involving them in war with the Porte, which deprived the King of Bosnia, Servia and Wallachia (Treaty of Belgrade 1739).

17. It was the general conviction in that time, that Austria was a dying State, and when Charles VI. died in 1740, the whole system of 1715 was perverted and Austria was attacked by her Northern, Western and Southern neighbours.

It was rather curious that his daughter Maria

bassador, John Frederick Graeve on 11 April 1722: „Gedenket man denen Ständen vorzustellen, wie unvermögend dassiges Reich jedesmal gewesen, der Ottomanischen Macht vor sich zu widerstehen und wie nöthig dahero es sey, by dem Hause Oesterreich beständig zu verbleiben. So wäre auch eben gedachtes Königreich durch Vermählungen an das Haus Oesterreich gekommen und endlich wenn alles aufs ausserste käme, so wurden Ihre Kayserliche Mayestät Successoren Sich der, enigen Macht welche Sie in denen hungarischen Vestungen und sonst hätten, selbst zu praevaliren wissen.“ Ibid Pag 508.

Theresia, (who was no longer an Empress, but only an Archduchess of Austria and a hereditary Queen of Bohemia, for whom Cardinal Fleury could find no formula in the archives of the French Foreign Office) instead of dissolving the Parliament of Hungary, as Bartenstein counselled, asked it to defend her against the political storm passing over Europe

The Prussians stood at Breslau, the Bavarians near Vienna, where the Austrian Khevenhüller had only twelve hundred men at his disposal, when the newly elected Palatine of Hungary, Count John Pálffy proclaimed a General Insurrection.

The garrison of Vienna was reinforced with Hungarian forces, which in the first month recaptured Linz and forced Frederick the Great to evacuate Bohemia, which was then taken over by Count Charles Batthyány, while Hadik made a raid as far as Berlin. Count Nádasdy occupied Bavaria and crossed the Rhine near Lauterburg, and at the same time at the battle of Dettingen Magyar hussars helped George II of England to victory. In five years the husband of Maria Theresia occupied the Imperial throne and Silesia only remained in foreign hands (1748).

18 The general result of the War for Hungary was the restoration of the national government under Palatine Pálffy, but for Austria it resulted in the complete triumph of Bartenstein, who attributed the success to the Austro-Russian alliance.

The grateful Queen confessed in 1748 that „there was nothing she would not willingly give to her loyal Magyars“. She reincorporated the thirteen towns of Szepes County, which came back from

Poland in 1772; she annexed Fiume, which was given by her to Croatia on the 14th February 1776, but owing to the protest of the population it was created a *corpus separatum* of the Hungarian Crown,¹ and she reunited the upper part of the so called „Banat” with the Motherland, restoring there the County Government, which was interrupted by the Turkish Invasion (1779).²

Bartenstein and his pupil Kaunitz, however swept away all other combinations in the Great Council of 1749, which determined the future policy of Austria. The two statesmen agreed to a *revanche* for Silesia, the Memorandum of Kaunitz being accepted without any hesitation, though it advocated the French Alliance and caused the Seven Years’ War with Frederick the Great.

The Ministers gained an unexampled influence at Court, and in 1760, the year of the capture of Berlin by the Austro-Russian forces, Kaunitz united all the Habsburg possessions under a new *Staatsrath* entrusted with both the internal and foreign affairs; thus Hungary again experienced the arbitrary influence of a rude Centralism, and this completely exhausted land was asked to give up her ancient Constitution.

1. It is generally admitted, that Hungary was then a state consisting of Nobles and Serfs; that the whole of taxation was paid by the latter, that the Court was now to suppress the privileges of the

¹ P. Pp. 263—66. ME. Pp 753—58.

² For the particulars cf. E. Szentkláray: „One hundred years of the history of Southern Hungary” (Hung.) Temesvár 1879.

landed classes and come to the relief of the poor, who in their oppression looked not to the Parliament of the landed classes, but to the Monarch. It must be added however, that the situation of the Hungarian *Jobbágy* was no worse than that of the peasant in the Western states, while the financial question as solved by the Austrian Government did an injury alike to both nobles and peasants that the relief of the poor gave an opportunity to the *Statsrath* and to an enlightened Monarch, like Maria Theresia, to declare war on the Church and landed Nobility; to dissolve the Parliament which afterwards was not assembled again until 1790, and to abolish the Palatinate, Albert Duke of Teschen, son-in-law of Maria Theresia being appointed Governor of Hungary (1765—81), and military Commander without any responsibility.

The Urbani Edict of 1765 (an urgent necessity for the relief of the *Jobbágy*), and its supplements issued by King Joseph II, the son of Maria Theresia and the pupil of Bartenstein, were consequently never presented to or accepted by the Parliament, which was not held at all from the dissolution of 1765 to the restoration of the Constitution in 1790.

II. The Census of the population and the survey of the land in the time of Joseph II resulted in a bloody revolt of the Roumanian peasants, while the German garrisons remained quiet, and thus the first racial war caused a complete aversion to the Viennese reforms inaugurated by the benevolent despotism of Maria Theresia and of his son, Joseph II.

III. The Edict of 1784 made German the official language of the Habsburg possessions, in 1785 the

Counties were abolished and the Kingdom was divided into administrative districts, the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen forming the VIII (Transylvania), IX. (Hungary) and X. (Croatia-Slavonia) of the thirteen Provinces of the great Habsburg State. The Viennese Government was eager to settle Hungary with German immigrants, and between 1715 and 1790 a long series of German villages were founded on the right bank of the Danube and on the left bank of the Tisza from Szatmar down to Fehérlétföld and Pancsova. No less than 7600 families settled in Southern Hungary at the cost of only 4000.000 Florins paid by Joseph II. who in his Patent of 21st September 1782 invited his German subjects to emigrate into his Hungarian Kingdom: „Wir Joseph der Andere von Gottes Gnaden erwählter römischer Kaiser, zu allen Zeiten Mehrer des Reichs, König in Ungarn, Böhmen, Galizien und Lodomerien etc. thun hiermit Jedermann kund, dass Wir in unseren Königreichen Ungarn, Galizien und Lodomerien viele unbesetzte, leere und öde Gründe besitzen, welche wir gesonnen sind, mit deutschen Reichsgliedern, besonders aus den Ober-Rheinkreise anzusiedeln".¹ The number of these *Reichseinwanderer* arose in King Joseph's time to 38.000.²

19. King Joseph's plans were not limited to his oppressed dominions.

France and Spain, united by their *pactes de famille* bourbonised Western Europe from Calais to Cadiz

¹ Published by Baron K. Czoernig: *Ethnographie der Oesterreichischen Monarchie*. Vol. III. Vienna 1855. Pp. 37—38.

² For Particulars *ibid.* Page 1—72.

and Palermo, and together with Austria they renewed a danger to the Maritime Powers and to the Anglo-Hanoverian Union.

At the same time Catherine II changed the Kaunitz policy of antagonism into an Alliance with Frederick the Great, but the Austro-Russian alliance remained in the eyes of Kaunitz the only barrier to the ambitions of Prussia. He duly accepted a definite partition of Turkey, proposed by Russia in 1782¹ on the ground that „l'Impératrice peut-être n'est déterminée que par ce seul espoir à préférer l'intime liaison avec Votre Majesté à celle du Roi de Prusse“,² but there was also Vergennes, who would not risk „son dernier homme et son dernier sou pour empêcher la ruine de l'Empire Ottoman“,³ and Frederick the Great, who at the same time successfully frustrated King Joseph's design on Bavaria. He united the German Princes under Prussian leadership (*Fürstenbund* 1785), while the last war with Turkey resulted in the collapse of the reforms of King Joseph and of the military power of Austria.

At the end of 1789 Belgium was proclaimed a Republic, in the beginning of 1790 the King revoked all his Edicts and died a misunderstood Prince, his many lands constituting a doubtful legacy to his brother Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany.

20 King Leopold II arrived on 6th March 1790 at Vienna, where he convoked the Provincial Diets

¹ Arneth A.: Joseph II. und Katherine von Russland. Ihr Briefwechsel. Vienna 1869.

² Brunner S.: Correspondances intimes de l'empereur Joseph II. Paris. 1871. Vol. II. Page 29.

³ 1. Arneth op cit. Pag. 190.

of Austria; on the 25th he returned to Prussia and Prince Kaunitz offered his resignation, on the 6th June the Parliament of Hungary was opened by him at Budapest; on the 12th he published the invitations to the Diet of Transylvania; on the 27th July the Convention of Reichenbach with Prussia formed a definite agreement, if not an alliance, against the danger of the French Revolution; on 19th September the armistice with Turkey was signed, on the 30th King Leopold was elected Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and on the 12th October Archduke Alexander was appointed Palatine of Hungary; on the 15th November the King was crowned and the Parliament opened a new period in the history of Hungary.

The Censorship was abolished and within a year 300 pamphlets were published in Hungary. *The Pia desideria cordis Hungarici* recommended the restoration of the Mediaeval Royal Council, the *Hungaria graviter aegra cura postulans* defended the rights of Parliament; the Bishop of Transylvania, Count Battyhány in his *Ad amicam aurem*, advocated a Government elected by the People, the Abbot Martinovich in his *Oratio ad Proceres*, followed the theory of Rousseau's *Contrat Social*, while his friend Hajnóczy, in his *De comitiis Regni Hungariae*, and in his *De regiae potestatis in Hungaria limitibus*, urged a Parliamentary Government on the English model, the same view being held by Aranka in his *Comparison of the English and Hungarian Administration* (*Anglus és Magyar igazgatásnak egybenvetése*), and by Professor Bantz in his *Dissertatio de potestate exequente regis Angliae*.

The laws of 1790 and 1791 proved a new

Compromise between the King and the Nation, on the ground that, „Hungaria cum partibus adnexis sit regnum liberum et independens, id est nulli alteri regno aut populo obnoxium, sed propriam habens consistentiam et constitutionem, adeoque etiam a Sua Maestate Sacratissima successoribusque ejus Hungariae regibus propriis legibus et consuetudinibus non vero ad normam aliarum provinciarum regendum et gubernandum“, while the Diet of Transylvania on the 7th March 1791 voted for reunion with Hungary (Transylv. Laws 1791. II. and VI. §).

21. There remained only one question unsolved by the King and his Parliament.

The budget of the Habsburg lands in 1763 showed an income of 54,000,000 and an expenditure of 1,500,000 Florins, and since the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen (Hungary, Transylvania, Croatia-Slavonia) contributed only 14,000,000, the Austrian Staatsrath declared War on the landed classes.

A pamphlet of Adam Kollar, the Director of the Imperial Library at Vienne: *De originibus et usu perpetuae potestatis apud Hungariae reges* (Vienna 1764) recommended general taxation, and Queen Maria Theresia proposed an increase of a million Florins in the budget of Hungary, and the transference of 10,000,000 from the Austrian debt amounting to 200,000,000. The proposal was however rejected, the Parliament of 1765 dissolved, the Palatinal Government suppressed and Duke Albert of Teschen appointed Lord Lieutenant of Hungary. It was a great mistake that the Parliament of 1790 failed to take up the financial question of 1765, and thus the chance of an economic agreement with Austria was neglected.

The question of Nationalities found a temporary solution.

I. In 1767 a separate government was created for Croatia, but in 1779 it was again suppressed, „quod sufficientia agenda non habuerit“, however the Croats formed a nation and not a nationality.

II. In Southern Hungary the Servian military districts (*Confinia*) were dissolved in 1749, but in 1767 others were formed and extended to all German, Servian and Roumanian settlements of the frontier Counties. The territorial rights of the Servian immigrants, who always enjoyed full ecclesiastical autonomy and held ten National Synods between 1707 and 1780 (1707 and 1710 at Krushedol, 1713 at Karlóca, 1731 at Belgrade, 1744, 1748, 1749, 1769, 1774 and 1780 at Karlóca) were vetoed by Queen Maria Theresia in 1779, but Patriarch Putnik proceeded to Vienna in March 1790 to tender the request of Patriarch Diakovich, made in 1708 and left unfulfilled by the Patent of 1713, before the Court. He was advised by the Chancellor, Count Charles Pálffy, that „as a nation Serbia does not exist in the territory of Hungary“, but on the 27th June the Serbs asked for a National Congress to be held at Temesvar, and it was opened by the Austrian General Baron John Schmidfeld, who in his opening speech of 1st September told the delegates: „Sie erscheinen als Vertreter der ganzen treugehorsamsten illyrischen Nation. Es ist ihnen aus allerhochster Huld verstattet ihr wahres Wohl zu gründen.“ The Congress on 7 September asked for a separate territory and the President answered: „Wo doch das Territorium bestimmt und auf die Möglichkeit der Excindirung desselben Bedacht

genommen sollte? . . . das Banat durch seine vortheilhafte Lage und die Angranzung an diejenigen Provinzen, die über kurz oder lang durch siegreiche Waffe des alldurchlauchtigsten Erzhauses Oesterreich wiedererobert, und mit dem zu excindirenden Territorio vereinigt werden könnte, ja auch deswegen weil dessen Inarticulation mit dem Königreich Ungarn noch nicht gesetzmässig vor sich gegangen ist, zur Excindirung des anstuchenden privilegialmassigen Territoriums die bequemste Provinz zu sein scheine, möge die löbliche Versammlung sich erklären, welches Land eigentlich sie für ihre Existenz zu haben wünsche, und ob nicht das Banat dazu das geschickteste Land wäre?"

It was a direct invitation to the partition of Hungary made by the *Hofkriegsrath*,¹ but on the 9th September Bishop Sabbas Tököli was anxious about the acceptance of the doubtful present. „Der grössere Theil unserer Nation ist aus Serbien gekommen“ — he stated in the Congress after the vote — „in Serbien waren die Sitze der Unserigen . . . Wie können wir es also wagen zu hoffen, dass man uns ein Eigenthumsrecht auf ein anderes Territorium einräume, auf ein solches, das in Ungarn einverleibt ist, das einen Bestandtheil dieses Königreiches bildet? Gleichwie jetzt so war auch einst das Temeser Banat in Ungarn einverleibt, die Ausscheidung stent im Widerspruche mit den Gesetzen des Landes, mit dem Krönungseid des Königs, und ist selbst mit unseren Privilegien nicht zu vereinbaren. Die Ge-

¹ Szalay L. Das Rechtsverhältniss der serbischen Niederlassungen zum Staate in den Ländern der ungarischen Krone. Leipzig, 1862. Pp. 73—74.

setze nämlich verbieten jegliches Lostrennen irgend eines Territoriums von Ungarn . . .¹ The Congress voted it an autonomous *Vojvodina* within the frontiers of Hungary, but this was not approved by the King. So on 30-th' June 1792 they asked for its abolition, and were satisfied with the seats of the Serb Prelates in the Upper House (1792. X. §)

III. In 1761 the non-united Roumanians received their first Bishop independent of the Serb Patriarch of Karlóca. He was enthroned by General Baron Adelphus Buccow, the Commander of the Imperial forces in Transylvania, and it was on behalf of both united and non-united Roumanian Churches, that in 1791 a *Supplex Libellus Valachorum* was submitted to the King with demands similar to those of the Serbs. „Dive Caesar Auguste! Est Natio Valachica omnium in Transylvania Nationum antiquissima . . .” This was the first appearance of the conviction of their Roman origin.² The King sent it to the Diet of Transylvania, where it was rejected by the three nations of the Principality, and the solution of the Roumanian question was unhappily postponed until the Revolution of 1848.

22. By the French Revolution Hungary was deprived of her long desired prosperity.

¹ Ibid Pp 77—80. The Latin text was published separately: *Sermo quem Sabbas Tököli, qua deputatus ad nationalem illyricum congressum 9. Septembris 1790 idiomate nationali fecit, in linguam Latinam deductus.* Pest 1791. The Serb text was published in the L M S Vo CV Ujvidek 1862. Page 94 et seq.

² *Supplex Libellus Valachorum Transylvanicae Jura Tribu receptis Nationibus Communis Postliminio sibi adseri Postulantium* Kolozsvár 1791

The fall of the Bastille destroyed the Austro-French Alliance and since their meeting at Pillnitz (25 August 1791) King Leopold was in close alliance with the King of Prussia.

His impassionate brother and successor, Francis II. (1791-1835) went further and in his fear of Revolution refused to maintain the Constitutional Government.

He restored the Censorship and in 1794 the leaders of the Hungarian *Illuminati*, the Abbot Martinovich, John Laczkovich, the Captain of a Hussar Regiment, and Joseph Hajnóczy, a reputed barrister and Secretary of the Treasury were executed, while the Poet Kazinczy and his many friends were imprisoned. So the Parliament of 1796 dropped all the reforms initiated in 1790.

Hungary, Croatia-Slavonia and Transylvania rose again to defend the Habsburg lands, the officers of the Palatine's Hussars and of the Duke of York's Regiment swearing together on Belgian soil, not to part company with each other till the end of the War. Allied Prussia however made a separate treaty with the French Republic at Basel in 1795, and Emperor Francis was compelled to accept the Treaty of Campoformio in 1797, by which he renounced all his claims to Belgium and acquired Venetia and Dalmatia, the latter at once addressing the Palatine on 10th July 1797 for reunion with Hungary, but it was incorporated into Austria by the pupil of Kaunitz, the Minister Baron Thugut.

After the battles of Marengo and Hohenlinden Emperor Francis was driven out of Germany by the Treaty of Luneville in 1801, and on the 11th August 1804 the Austrian Empire was founded, the Holy Roman Empire being dissolved on the 6th Aug. 1806.

Francis Habsburg became Emperor of Austria and Apostolic King of Hungary, the Royal Patent of 17th August 1804 assuring the States of the Realm that the legal position of Hungary remainend unchanged. „visum est haecreditari Imperatoris Austriae, utpote augustae domus Nostrae cognomine quam solemniissime hisce ea tamen ratione assumere et stabilire, ut universa Regna, principatus et provinciae Nostrae titulis, Constitutionibus ac jurebus suis, quibus hactenus gaudebant, in posterum quoque cetera mutationem illibate fruantur.”

But the foundation of the Austrian Empire brought a complete change in the relation between King and Nation, because without Germany Austria would fall back to the Union of 1437 with Hungary and Bohemia, both lands aiming their independence, and reducing the Imperial title to the German Provinces of Austria.

The Dual Monarchy was inaugurated.

23. The successor of Baron Thugut, Count Cobenzl lost another War in 1805, his successor, Count Stadion a third one in 1809, but Hungary remained faithful to the King and to her vows against French hegemony. Some parts of these wars were fought on her own territory.

Marshal Davout occupied Pozsony in November 1805, demanded from the Palatine the suppression of the Insurrection and offered a guarantee for the neutrality of Hungary, but the great design of Napoleon was frustrated by the nation, an Illyrian Province only being created by him on the advice of the Serb bishop Sava Toköli.¹

¹ As to his memoir of 1804 to Emperor Napoleon cf. MSTR. Vol. I Budapest, 1918. Page 221.

In 1809 Vienna was taken by the French and Eugene Beauharnais forced his way from Italy to Győr on the Danube, where the last Hungarian Insurrection under the Palatine Archduke Joseph lost a decisive battle on the 14th June 1809, but the nation listened unmoved to the flattering manifest of Napoleon, which announced the liberation of Hungary from the Habsburgs and the restoration of the elective kingdom (15th May 1809).'

On the other hand, the Parliaments of 1792-1808 voted large forces and subsidies for the War; the government of the Palatine Archduke Alexander (1790-95) and of Archduke Joseph (1795-1847) was very popular; the making of the Magyar the official language instead of the Latin was however counter-balanced by autocratic measures of the Court in the financial question.

The dept of the Austrian Empire rose from 300 million Florins in 1790 to 600 millions in 1806, the paper money to half a milliard. The Imperial Edict of 19th December 1809 reduced the paper value to the one third of the silver florin, and Count Wallis, the Minister of Finance on 10th February 1811 reduced the 1060 millions to 212 million *scheins* (certificates). The King asked the Parliament of 1811 to take over 100 million *scheins* (certificates) of the Austrian dept, but the opposition demanded a detailed account of the Budget and of the debt, and when Count Wallis objected, the Patent was rejected by an unanimous vote on 10th February 1811. Three

' Published at the CN. Vol. XIX. Pag. 11. It was translated into Hungarian by the Poet Bacsányi, who was interned for it at Linz in Austria.

days after the address of 17th May, at midnight on the 20th a Royal Secretary brought an order to vote for or to prepare for the dissolution, and the session was closed by the Palatine, who next day (21th May 1812) read the Royal Order of dissolution.

24. The question of Hungary now became an European question.

Talleyrand desired both Hungary and Austria to be the „principal boulevard que l'Europe ait à leur opposer“, but the Russians of Admiral Chichagow moved from Bucarest to the Carpathians in order to take Transylvania and to invade Hungary (1812), then an ally of the French by the Austrian Treaty of Marriage of 1810. After the retreat of Napoleon, the Russian invasion was abandoned and the Hungarian forces joined the Allies under the command of Prince Schwarzenberg, a Captain of Magyar Hussars inducing the King of the Swedes to join and so turning the battle of Leipzig into a defeat for Napoleon.

The name of this captain was Count Stephen Széchenyi, who shortly afterwards struck out into a new path in the political development of Hungary, adapting the country to the Western Ideas, and making it the stronghold against and the gate of Western Civilisation towards the East; at home a flourishing land and in its relation a new problem for Austria, which based the Dual Monarchy on autocratic Centralism or *de facto* on the curious *Federation* of the Vienna Government.

CHAPTER II.

Reform of the Constitution. 1815—1848.

VII. Prince Metternich's Parliamentarism 1815—1832.

25. Two European states only were omitted from the Treaties of 1815. The one was the Ottoman Empire excluded by the will of Alexander of Russia, the other Hungary, which was not recognised as an independent kingdom. Maria Theresia, who was only Queen of Hungary, was no more; there was a victorious Emperor of Austria, the whose interest and ambition it was to have a compact realm and a dominating position. His Foreign Minister, Prince Clement Metternich, secured for his master the hegemony over both Germany and Italy, and thus in 1815 we see in another form a Holy Roman Empire extending from the North Sea to the Mediterranean with its capital at Vienna, and leaving in the shade the little kingdom of Hungary.

But this *Reich der Mitte*, as it was styled by its founder, Prince Metternich, was a large territory to be held together by the feeble state of Austria, which never formed a state in any true sense of the word. It was rather a mediaeval *patrimonium*, whose ruler was an autocrat, called by Providence to govern the

millions left to his grace, its emperors never acknowledged any nations in this *patrimonium*; they always addressed their subjects as „*meine Völker*“ and never used the word nation; not even in Hungary.

But the peoples of the last *senior* of a forgotten past demanded constitutions and when in 1820 in several countries of South Europe the Charter of Cadix (1812) was proclaimed, the movement triumphed in both Savoy and Sicily and from the South it rapidly advanced towards the *Reich der Mitte*.

Prince Metternich was fully aware of the danger and he did all in his power to exclude from his dominions the idea of Constitutionalism. He had already granted Charters to some of the Austrian Provinces, but they contained nothing like responsible Government. There was not even an Imperial Government in Austria, because the son-in-law of Prince Kaunitz was only the Chief Minister of the Court and the *major domus* of the Emperor. He dominated the whole sphere of the Court, political and foreign affairs, while war, commerce and finances were administered by special Councils and Chambers appointed on the advice of the Chancellor; Hungary had only a nominal Government with all its splendour, but without any real power worthy of its historical traditions.

But a crescent-shaped state stretching from Cattaro in the South to Czernovitz in the East and incorporating various national elements and territories, could hardly last without the centre upon which the whole Empire was based. This centre was Hungary, and so a peaceful and contented Hungary became the vital condition of an Austrian Empire. And as

Hungary was a historic state and the Hungarian people formed a constitutional kingdom. Prince Metternich, in his opposition to the Western constitutional movement, had against his will to appeal to a constitutional nation unparalleled among the many peoples and provinces of Austria.

26. Hungary had no interest in the new Charters of Europe.

However, in the shadow of a mighty Empire, she remained quiet and this gave to King Francis I., who in the autumn of 1820 went to Budapest to address his subjects the famous words: „The world has gone mad and wants Constitutions. How happy you are in having an old one; my desire is that you should retain for ever.“

Prince Metternich, completely satisfied with the tour of his august Sovereign, sent two Royal Patents to Hungary: that of the 4th April 1821 relating to the calling out of recruits, and that of the 13th August 1821 on the paying of taxes in coin instead of in paper.

Austrian intervention in Italy therefore was to be effected by the money and man of Hungary.

But on this rock Vienna suffered shipwreck.

27. By her old Constitution Hungary had a responsible government and this government was nominal only because Parliament had not been convoked since 1812. Lacking a Parliament part of the Legislative Power fell back to the Counties, and as a Royal Patent could be executed by a Parliament alone, without such it was opposed by the Counties.

The much praised old Constitution therefore became a barrier in the way of the Vienna Government and Prince Metternich appealed to arms.

In most of the Counties the Patents had been registered with military assistance, but in many places the Royal Commissioners were unable to hold assemblies because all the officials had resigned, the County Halls had been closed and in a short time it was impossible to reach even the capital of the County, the roads being barricaded.

The policy of the Government met with general opposition and as the greatest dissatisfaction was manifested in the very centre of the Austrian Empire, by the Royal warrant of 3rd July 1825 Prince Metternich appealed from the disobedient Counties to an obedient Parliament, to the institution then unknown in Central Europe and detested in arbitrary Austria.

From that time an ever widening difference arose between the King's other countries and Hungary, which became „the oasis of Liberty in the lonely world of Absolutism surrounded by arbitral Powers, like Turkey and Russia“, as an English visitor wrote shortly afterwards.'

28. The restoration of the Parliamentary Government in its final consequence led to a national revival; to Prince Metternich it appeared only a negative and futile opposition similar to that of 1812 and an instrument necessary to procure soldiers.

He reckoned with an united front in a Parliament composed of County delegates and intended to break this front by gaining over the moderates and majorizing the radicals. When the Chancellor asked King Francis if he held the old Constitution as the

Miss Pardoe: „The city of the Magyar, or Hungary and her institutions in 1839—40“ London, 1850.

basis of the Hungarian State, he answered: „I shall keep the oath I took to it“. „If so, then His Majesty should give a definite form to this and the Government should take the initiative in order to abolish general unrest.“¹

It is not generally known that the man, who everywhere destroyed Parliamentarism, in Hungary became a party leader and preferred the way of concessions, in order to create a majority for the Government, which by its own will had renounced or arbitrary policy. He advocated the same object along the smooth path of Constitutionalism, and in that way he believed in a complete victory. He only regretted that he must change his Vienna home for an apartment at Pozsony: that there instead of German he must speak Latin and dress like a Hussar, his only privilege being that he need not have a moustache. But he would not leave for a long period; he would rather go to and fro fifty times, his journeys amounting to twelve hundred miles, the distance between Vienna and St. Petersburg.²

All went well and everything seemed favourable for the Government.

The Lower House united the representatives of the Counties, but the opposition was skilfully disarmed by the Speaker, the *Personalis Regius*, Sigismund Szögyény to the full satisfaction of the Prince („Szögyény ist gediegenes Gold“)³ while the Upper

¹ 26th June 1849 Richmond. Memorandum of Prince Metternich to Prince Schwarzenberg, N P Vol. VIII, Pp. 480—81.

² 32 rd August 1825. *Ib.d.* Vol. IV. Pp 190—91.

³ K L Vo. 4173. Vol. XVIII. 1908. Page 280.

House of the Conservative Magnates was led by the first dignity of the Realm, the popular Palatine Archduke Joseph.

The Royal Message read on the 18th September was a full recognition of the historic Constitution and resulted in general satisfaction, but before the opposition was broken up, on the 3rd November an event occurred which turned the tide against the victorious Government. On that morning a hot debate arose about a Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the desire of the last two Centuries, but a lost cause in a land ruled by an alien Government. In the midst of a long speech by Paul Nagy de Felsöbük, the Leader of the Opposition, a man came up to the table and offered his annual revenue, an act which was in a short time followed by other offers and led to the foundation of the present Academy.¹

This man was Count Stephen Széchenyi, the seventh son of the founder of the National Museum and the academy was only the first of his many creations all tending towards an active national policy, as he publicly stated in his address of 8th November before the Palatine.

Prince Metternich clearly saw the difference between the juridical opposition of the States and the national opposition of Count Széchenyi, who was at once ordered to join his regiment at Milan. But the Count resigned and after his return he emancipated Hungarian society from the influence of Vienna and created a new and national life at Budapest.

¹ For particulars vide Charles Szász Count Stephen Széchenyi and the Foundation of the Academy. Budapest 1880.

which became the centre of the whole country. The concluding words of his book published in January 1830 under the title: „Hitel“ (Credit), which had an unprecedented literary and political success, will always remain a consolation: „Many people think that Hungary has a past — *I believe that she has a future*“.

It was this future, towards which the national revival set out; which seemed hopeless to the old opposition, rich in grievances but poor in positive results, and above all dangerous to Prince Metternich, who met with no difficulties in disarming the windbags, but lost his chances before a national movement started by a young man who by the *esprit d'association* and by his social reforms strengthened public opinion whose ideal was complete liberation from the Vienna influence.

And that movement had its origin in the Parliament summoned by Prince Metternich, one of the greatest enemies of Parliamentarism.

30. European conditions made a declaration of war on the reform movement impossible.

Owing to the need of recruits the Chancellor summoned another Parliament on 15 July 1830.

There was no doubt that if once the recruits were voted, Parliament would be dissolved, but the Royal warrant reached the Counties together with the first news of the French Revolution and the States abjured every opposition. There was no further difference between Court and Parliament and Metternich's victory was complete. This victory seemed to win him definitely over to the Parliamentary System as on 24th October 1832 he convoked a third Parliament.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the Prince had any pleasure in Parliamentarism; it was rather

the unique position of Hungary which he relied upon against the Revolutions of the West and the Militarism of Holy Russia and therefore he let the nation enjoy its harmless old Constitution.

The troublesome Count Széchenyi was sent to the Southern Danube.

VIII. Prince Metternich and Russia. 1815—1834.

31. Prince Metternich as a man born on the Rhine, who had no real aptitude for the affairs of Eastern Europe, but from his Vienna bureau he clearly saw the advance of the Russians towards Constantinople and the Carpathians.

To hold and preserve Hungary, therefore, was to him equivalent to building up an unsurmountable barrier against Eastern encroachment and so by facing the Russian advance to the Mediterranean he was compelled to endorse the noble role of the past Centuries, when Hungary was a „*propugnaculum Christianorum*“ against the Turks.

The Russian advance was foreshadowed at the Vienna Congress, where Tsar Alexander I. desired to exclude Turkey from the treaties of 1815 and by his aggressive policy he forced the Prince to fix his eyes at the sick man of Stambul. Through his secretary, Frederick Gentz he promised every assistance to the Sultan, who if left alone would be no match for Russia, but he urged in vain the Porte to ask for guarantees from Vienna. The desired answer to his letter of February 1814 arrived only at the very end of the Congress and the demand was strongly opposed by Russia, which in the last hour happened to find an ally in Lord Castlereagh. Gentz cal-

led it a „Kapitalfehler“ on behalf of England and this „Kapitalfehler“ was only made good by the Crimean War.¹

32. The first Russian envoy after the treaties of 1815, Baron Gregory Alexandrovitch Stroganov passed the Bosphorus without the permission of the Sultan in September 1816 and returned in July 1822 to Odessa leaving behind an ultimatum. War was only averted by the mediation of Prince Metternich, who sent the Russian Ambassador, Count Dimitri Pavlovitch Tatitcheff home empty handed.

Tsar Alexander now turned to the Greeks and sought to establish four Greek Principalities dependent on Russia, but his grand design was frustrated, when on 13th March 1825 in the Petersburg *réunion* the Austrian Ambassador Count Lebzeltern proposed an independent Greece in order to erect a new barrier on the ground of nationalism, as „Turkey is a natural barrier for us, a barrier equal to a sea frontier for Austria, but on the very day when it will be replaced by a Christian Greece, this state will be a natural and active ally for us.“²

And so — it seems quite incredible — the formation of independent Greece was partly due to Prince Metternich, who by this step deprived Holy Russia of the fruits of her Turkish War of 1828 and 1829, when the Russians under old Count Ivan Ivanitch Diebitch advanced as far as the Chataldja line. The Russian Governor of Greece, the Corfiote Count John Kapodistrias fell a victim of his Russophil po-

¹ 22th Jan. 1816. Gentz to Prince Metternich. B. E. Vol. II. 1. Page 324.

² NP. Vol. IV. Page 307.

licy; his brother Count Agostino took the ashes of Count John to a Russian frigate and left Greece for ever.

33. After this complete defeat Alexander turned to Poland, which rose as one man against Russian autocracy, and by the Imperial ukase of 26th February 1832 he incorporated it in his Russian Empire.

During the Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29 there was no Parliament in Hungary, but the Polish question was fully treated in the subsequent Parliaments of both 1830 and 1832.

The Parliament of 1830 asked for the reunion of Galicia and on 24th September a mixed commission was nominated by the King, but the reunion being opposed by Prince Lobkowitz the question remained in abeyance.¹

Baron Nicholas Wesselényi in the County Assembly of Szatmár on 7th June 1831, Francis Deák on 23th November and Paul Nagy de Felsőbük on 27th November 1833 in the House of Commons demanded mediation in the interest of the Poles. Owing to the revolutionary movements in France, Italy, Germany and Poland Prince Metternich stood side by side with Russia, but he was also fully aware of the difference between the Polish insurrection and the Russian advance towards the frontiers of Hungary and Austria, and therefore so he did nothing to prevent the fulminant speeches of the opposition in the Hungarian Parliament.

„Was Poland erected as a constitutional state independent of Russia for her own sake or in the in-

¹ Cf. the article of Professor Askenazy in the *Revue politique internationale*. Vol. V. Lausanne, 1916 Page 48. and seq. For other publications see Appendix.

terest of the neighbouring states and of the whole Empire?" asked Paul Nagy de Felsőbük on 27th November 1827. „Is it not detrimental to His Majestys prestige to see the subversion of the Polish Constitution and the incorporation of Poland into the Russian Empire because the perpetual independence of Poland was a special interest of His Majesty at the Vienna Congress? Who can blame us, therefore, that we are now looking with no small anxiety to our frontiers, seeing on two-third of the whole frontier of Hungary a Great Power which in past years was known, to us only as a very distant country? If His Majesty, honoured by all the Princes of Europe, could live for ever and His Government were successful in its work for peace, we should have no anxiety; but if these circumstances should be changed and another Tsar should wish to extend his frontiers in such a manner that Austria must say to him: „*non plus ultra!*“ would not then our dearly beloved Fatherland become the theatre of a terrible war, or perhaps the easy prey of a victorious enemy? His Majesty will permit us to assure him that we are ready to make every sacrifice, in the interest of our Fatherland, if His Majesty should desire to restore the independence of Poland or if he desired in one other way to secure the safety of our Fatherland, his own safety or that of Europe with the help of the Powers guaranteeing the Vienna treaties.”

This speech, then the mirror of public opinion of Hungary, was left unanswered, though it was acted upon by Prince Metternich, who rightly left Poland definitely to Russia in order to save the Holy Alliance; but at the same time he circumvented by

every means in his power the treaty of Hunkiar Kessai forced upon the Sultan by Count Atexej Orlov on 8th July 1833, in order to make Turkey a vassal state of Tsar Nicholas. His masterly counterstroke was the treaty of 18th September 1833, signed at Münchengraetz, in which the Russo-Turkish treaty was abandoned. He wrote with delight to Prince Esterházy, Ambassador at the Court of Saint James: „This treaty is an admirable success and it binds the hands of the Russian intervention so completely that we should have to be placated in the remotest corner of Europe instead of holding it in secret.”

IX. The Nationalities. 1815—1832.

34. The question of the Hungarian nationalities deserves particular impartiality.

Firstly, we must admit that it would be contrary to historical facts to say that the nationalities of Hungary had no right of their own before and after 1815 because this supposition is refused by their flourishing and steady expansion.

We cannot help feeling that we found no signs pointing to an effort „to destroy the Serb language and to stamp out the Serb nationality in Hungary”, as we have read in a clever book published in England on the history of Serbia during the War. It is not in contradiction with the investigations of the same author that the Servian Senate was formed according to the recommendation of one Filipovits, born in Hungary, and that the first secondary school of Belgrade was erected on the model recommended by another Serb who came from Hungary, whose name was Jugovitch?

We may go still further, since it was in Buda that the first review of the Serbs, the *Srpski Ljetopis* was started in 1825, the very year of the foundation of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Later on, in 1836 a Serb *Matica* was founded under the presidency of the Serb Bishop Sava Tökoli likewise at Buda, and these facts certainly are in contradiction with the above. Moreover it was in Buda that the Slovak Joseph Pavel Schafarik, the headmaster of the Serb High School of Ujvidék (Germ. Neusatz, Serb. Novosad), the existence of that school being another refutation of the above, published the first systematic account of the Slavonic languages as a whole (*Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten*. Buda 1826. Second edition 1869.), as it was in Pest, that the Slovak Jan Kollar's planslavistic poem, the *Slavy Dcera* was published in 1832, while the author remained as he was since 1819, the Slovak minister of the Lutheran parish of Pest.

35. As to the Roumanians, it would be quite sufficient to call attention to a Roumanian work published by the Hungarian University Press at Buda in 1812. The book was written by Peter Maior, who from 1809 to 1821, and this date shows that he retained his post also after its publication, was the Roumanian proof-corrector of the University Press at Buda. And so at the Hungarian University Press was published that famous book: *Istoria pentru inceputului Romanilor in Dacia* (Buda 1812), of which Eliade Radulescu, one of the great men of modern Roumania once said that „this book, like the rod of Moses, separated the sea of light from the darkness and made it possible for the Rouma-

nian people to know their origin". In this book we first read the legend that the Roman legions of Emperor Trajan remained in Dacia and preserved it ever until this day against the invading Magyars.

We may go further still. The Roumanian refugees who crossed the Carpathians in 1821 with the leaders of the Greek Revolution, could not speak Roumanian, but only Greek; it was one single bojar who used his mother tongue, and this was "*le premier roumain moderne*". Constantin Radovici din Golescu, who described his journey and published it in 1826 at the Hungarian University Press of Buda under the following title: "*Insemnare a calatoriei mele Const. Radovici din Golescu facuta in anul 1824, 1825, 1826*". (Buda 1826).

It was at Nagyszeben that in 1828, Heliade Radulescu published his Roumanian grammar, the first book used in the first national school of Bucarest and it was his compatriot, George Lazar, who transplanted the Latin culture to Roumania from a land where certainly no national culture would exist if it had been extinguished by the Magyars.

36. The Croation question was a national and not a nationality one, the Croats being ever recognised as a nation and their land as a Kingdom of Croatia (*Partes adnexae; Regnum Croatiae, Slavoniae et Dalmatiae.*).

When in the Parliament of 1825 Magyar was proposed as the official language of the Realm, the Croatian delegates objected and the law was formulated with the condition: "*intra fines regni*".

The Vienna Government however succeeded in exploiting the difference between the Croats and the Magyars.

The Vienna Treaties of 1815 gave back the Adriatic shores of Hungary and Croatia together with Dalmatia, a province dependent on the Venetian Republic from 1409 to 1797. The Government did not restore them to Croatia or to Hungary (until 1102 they formed part of Croatia, from 1102 to 1409 of Hungary) but formed a separate Illyrian Province (1814—22) dependent exclusively on the Vienna Government. At last on 5th July 1822 King Francis sanctioned the Hungarian Law of 1807. IV. §, but he gave back Fiume to Hungary under the curious condition that it should send a representative to the Croatian sabor also. Fiume therefore was at the same moment offered by the King to his two separate Kingdoms, and from that time to the last Revolution (1822—1918) the Fiume question remained a grave unsolved problem between Hungary and Croatia.

The nationality question was therefore a weapon in the hand of the Austrian Government held between the Magyars and the nationalities of Hungary in order to prevent their union in the interest of United Austria.

37. The treaty of Münchengraetz gave free hand to Prince Metternich against the liberal movement in Italy, Germany and Hungary.

He saw everywhere the secret agents of the Franco-Italian and Franco-Polish revolutionary committees founded in the Paris rooms of the Marquis of Lafayette, but we have no proof that French influence created any change in Hungarian politics. It was rather the constitutional movement of 1832, whose of which both mind and heart were thoroughly Magyar.

X. *Crisis and Compromise with Austria. 1832—1840.*

We must however admit that a difference arose between the reformers

Count Széchenyi seemed to Prince Metternich a most dangerous radical because he did not accept the grievances so masterfully enumerated in the endless speeches of the old Opposition. He was ever building new national institutions, bridges, mills and roads, which will last as long as Hungary endures.

He was not disposed to disappear again with his regiment at Milan, but he was ready to spend several months in a boat studying how the Southern Danube could be opened to traffic. Prince Metternich accordingly sent him to the Southern Danube as the only means of excluding him from politics.

But the public opinion created by Metternich's two Parliaments and by the liberal movement of Europe sent to the third Parliament new men, who differed as much from the old as from the new Oppositions. To them the party of Paul Nagy de Felsőbük was old and obsolete, while Count Széchenyi was a Conservative, who never advocated political, only social and economic reforms.

Francis Kölcsey, the delegate of Szatmár County, Francis Deák, delegate of Zala County, Baron Nicholas Wesselényi, a Member of the Upper House and Louis Kossuth, a young man, who published their brilliant speeches, all preferred political liberty to economic improvement, and they became the leaders and the soul of the liberal movement of 1832.

38. First of the four was Francis Kölcsey, the silent poet and the noblest thinker of his age, whose

only eye and feeble voice galvanized the opposition and embarrassed the numerical minority of the Government. But his leadership did not last long. The County Assembly of Szatmár turned Loyalist and Koltsey was recalled in 1835.

Baron Wesselényi, who walked hand-in-hand with him on calm nights at Pozsony, took over the leadership, but in many things he had entirely different manners and methods. He came from Transylvania where he was persecuted by the Court.

The Diet of Transylvania had for a long time not been convoked. When General Baron Francis Wlassics, sent out as a Royal Commissioner in 1833, reported that public opinion was justified in its demands, he was replaced by Archduke Ferdinand, the Governor of Galicia, and the Diet was convoked on 18th March 1834.

On the morning of the 26th May, the day of the opening of Parliament the States found the doors closed and the exasperation was intensified by the proposition of the Government relating to the nomination of 231 new, as against the 92 existing, members. The address of the Diet presented to the King, as Grand Prince of Transylvania, on 3th October at Brünn was promptly rejected, a Candidate of the minority appointed and the printing of the Protocols prohibited.

On 29th January 1835, Baron Wesselényi distributed copies of the Protocol in the Chamber and announced with his clear voice: „I have the honour to announce to the honourable States, I am having it printed myself, Nicholas Wesselényi “

The Diet took the diary under its own protection, but on 6th February next the Archduke dissolved

the „infamous“ Diet and Baron Wesselényi was prosecuted (18th Marh).

39. Prince Metternich was fully aware of the bad news from Transylvania and appealed to the Nationalities.

On the 6th Januáry the *Novine Hrvatske, Slavonske y Dalmatinske* was started at Zagreb — „sowohl den äusseren als inneren, der Konsistenz der Gesamtmonarchie schädlichen Einflüssen einen Damm zu setzen“ —¹ and Croatia was to be made a counterbalance to the liberal movement in Hungary.

On the face of it the Illyrian movement seemed a Yugoslav national movement, but in reality the Yugoslav question was not a simple, but ever a double if not a triple question.

The Croats formed a historic nation, the Serbs a distinct nationality. The former had large autonomy and an autonomous Government, the latter a separate and autonomous Church amounting to a political autonomy. But the Croats were Catholic and imbued by Western Civilisation, while the Serbs formed the part of an Oriental Church inseparably connected with an Oriental World. Latins and Greeks only united for shorter periods and against a common enemy, and the Austrian *Hofkriegsrath* was entrusted to unite them in the interest of Austrian Centralism against the national movement of the Magyars. In the secret Archives of the Vienna Court numerous documents have been found relating to the secret work of the Austrian Government.²

And so came into existence the Illyrian movement

¹ Sz. Vol. XLVI. 1912. Page 480

² Cf. C. Tábori op. cit.

to balance the national evolution of Hungary, a movement tending to the full emancipation and union of the Southern Slavs — a great idea including all territories „between Scutari, Varna and Villach“, as it was openly stated in the Supplement of the *Novine*, the *Danica* (6th Dec. 1835), but an irredentist idea since these territories belonged to the Austrian Empire and to the Kingdom of Hungary in the North and to Turkey in the South.

If Prince Metternich preferred Irredentism to Constitutionalism, he was certainly convinced of the greater strength of the latter. The Imperial Commanders at Zagreb and at Temesvár were strong enough with their foreign troops to oppose every movement on the spot and united with the Croats and Serbs they formed an insurmountable barrier to the movement of the Magyars.

Thus it happened that three days before the *Novine* appeared, on the 3th January 1835, the Young Men's Union at Pozsony was dissolved; on 27th March Baron Wesselényi was sentenced in Transylvania; on 2nd May 1836 after Parliament was dissolved, he was prosecuted even in Hungary. „I am expelled from my estate and must seek an asylum far away from it. In the land for which I have worked so much and whose happiness was my study, my name is on the list of the sons of sin and shame. My person, like the hunted beast of the forest has been given over to be persecuted by everyone“, he wrote in his diary. On 30th May the leader of the Young Men's Union, Ladislas Lovassy, and on 5th May 1837 Louis Kossuth, editor of the *Parliamentary Advertiser* (*Országgyűlési*, later *Törvényhatósági Tudósítások*) were cast into prison.

Lovassy was sentenced to 10 years, Baron Wesselényi to 3, and Kossuth to 3½ years imprisonment.

The opposition was crushed and the national movement found a counterbalance in the movement of the nationalities.

40. It was therefore a great surprise to Prince Metternich that in the Parliament opened on 5th June 1839 the Liberals found a new leader in young Francis Deák, whose name has been placed by one of his admirers before all the great statesmen of the world, because he made no enemies.

He rose sixty-six times to address the House, which sent twentythree petitions over to the House of Peers in defence of the freedom of speech and on behalf of the imprisoned leaders of the national movement. The twentythird petition caused the Peers to break silence and the amnesty of the King opened the prison doors (29th April 1840); but Lovassy was already mad and Baron Wesselényi a blind old man.

Prince Metternich lost the battle against the Constitution. Archduke Ferdinand was ambitious for the governorship of Transylvania, but he was not even nominated by the members sitting in the shadow of the bayonets of the Imperial Commander at Nagyszében; and at length the king appointed poor Count John Kornis, whose name was sixth and last on the list. The Government gave way before the union of King and Nation, this being the first *Ausgleich* between Hungary and Austria. „Parliamentary eloquence never had a more brilliant epoch than the Parliament of 1833—40“, was the opinion of an on-

looker:¹ „we saw ourselves on the threshold of a new and happier age“, remarked Ladislas Szögyény² while Count Széchenyi exclaimed: „My Lord, I am happy to see we have broken in pieces our chains and we live again to the welfare of Humanity, a revived nation“.

XI. Struggle for the Majority. 1841 1848.

41. After the *Ausgleich* of 1840 Prince Metternich desired definitely to remain on a parliamentary basis in Hungarian matters and he strove for the leadership of the majority.

The greatest barrier on this path was the liberal Kossuth, and the Chancellor intended to meet him face to face.

His plan was as follows: „Mein Gefühl ist, dass man ihn kommen lassen müsse, und er wird kommen, oder in dem Kampfe unterliegen“,³ and so it happened that Louis Landerer, the proprietor of a printing house offered him the editorship of the newly founded *Pesti Hírlap*. Two days after this arrangement (31th December 1840) was made, on 2nd January 1841 the paper was started, and Kossuth arrived. But he came with invisible weapons, which the censor was unable to discover in the mere words of the agitator and in the autumn of 1841 he reported that he could make no modification of the articles, as they ought to be entirely omitted; but this would whereby arouse general interest in the blank

¹ B. Sz. Vol. XXXII. 1882. Page 259

² Sz. E. Vol. I. Page 17.

³ TTK Page 59.

space in the paper and thus no solution, would be arrived at, because the best articles had already been given by Kossuth in his speeches delivered at the Assembly of Pest County.¹

The articles contained the full programme of the modern Parliamentary Government, but the mere political ideas built up without any real basis made Count Széchenyi an outspoken enemy of Kossuth.

Thus was published his famous book: the „*A Kelet népe*” (People of the East. Pest, 1841), which prophesied the coming Revolution.

Kossuth in his reply „*Felelet gróf Széchenyi Istvánnak*” (Answer to Count Stephen Széchenyi. Pest, 1841), called him the *Greatest Magyar*, a name applied from that time to Count Széchenyi, and controversy resulted in the formation of a Conservative Party inclining towards Prince Metternich's Government.

Count Széchenyi himself was not a party leader and he handed the organisation over to his young friend, Count Aurel Dessewffy, a man of high talent. In his paper, „*Világ*” (World) he took up the campaign against Kossuth and laid down the guiding principles of a Conservative policy, but by his premature death in 1842 his friends lost their leader.

Thus it came to pass that the Parliament of 1843-44, in which Francis Deák resigned his seat, proved a period of truce between the preparations made in the years 1841-42 and 1845-48.

42. The plan of the government was worked out at Vienna, where King Ferdinand V, by his decree of 4-th July 1844 created a secret Committee. Its leader

¹ Sz. E. Vol. I. Pp. 19-20.

was Prince Metternich, its members the Councillors of the Hungarian and Transylvanian Chancelleries. One of these, George Majláth was instructed to propose resolution against the County Governments, all of which had been won over by Louis Kossuth.

Five days earlier, on 30-th June, Kossuth was forced to resign the editorship of the *Pesti Hirlap*. In the autumn he called upon Prince Metternich at Vienna in order to obtain the concession of another paper and he has described his interview in a letter written to Francis Deák on the steamer „Friedrich” on 4-th October following. The Prince confessed that it was a political error to apply an autocratic Government to Hungary, which had a historic Constitution. It is now his earnest desire to make a definite change: „There must be change and I wish that there should be a change”. He openly told Kossuth: „For years I have observed your career with the greatest interest and I tell you plainly that I consider you the first political writer of Hungary, and the present belongs to you political writers”.¹ He did not however grant him the desired concession of a new paper.

On the homeward journey of Kossuth, on 10-th October, the Secret Committee held another sitting and George Majláth submitted his proposition relative to the Counties.

As nearly all the counties had accepted the leadership of Louis Kossuth and his „*Pesti Hirlap*” had become their official gazette, while the Parliament was a mere delegation of the Counties, they were

¹ TL. Vol I. 1874. Pp. 145—200 KW. Vol II. Pp. 151—160

to be taken out of the hands of the officials elected on the basis of a complete autonomy and receive an administrator nominated by the Government. In order to eliminate the precedent of 1822, all members of the Government dealing with Hungarian affairs and all administrators were to be chosen from the Hungarian nobility. Count George Apponyi became Chancellor of the Court, a popular man imbued with the noble ideas of his friend, Count Dessewffy and his skilful tactics proved of great service to Prince Meternich. As early as 8-th November 1845 Deák wrote to Baron Wesselényi that „there are perhaps no more than 10 Counties which would follow the opposition, which is nullified everywhere“.¹

43. The Government joined the Conservatives and Count Széchenyi also joined the Prince against the hated leader of the Liberals.

Thus came into existence the party of the Conservatives supported by the Government of Prince Meternich. Its prominent members were Count Stephen Széchenyi and Count Anthony Szécheni; its first conference took place at the House of the Treasurer (Magister Tavernicorum), Count Gabriel Keglevich, on 12th November 1846, but its programme was purely negative: to follow the Government.

The Opposition was led by Louis Kossuth, who was joined by two important representatives of public opinion. The one and the stronger was Francis Deák, the personification of law and order, justice and right, one word of whom had greater weight than the whole Conservative party; the other was

¹ D. E. Pag. 162.

Count Louis Batthyány, a supporter of society. There he inclined towards his friend, Kossuth, as in politics he ever did.

The programme of the Liberals was laid down by Kossuth in his new paper, the *Hetilap* (started on 2nd January 1846) and by Francis Deák in his *Manifesto of the Opposition* dated 6th June 1847, and was as follows: Parliamentary government and an *Ausgleich* between Hungary and Austria. At the same time appeared the *Ellenőr*, a political handbook published by the Opposition Club at Pest (Leipzig 1847), where Kossuth appealed to the nation: „to make its choice between the Conservatives and the Liberals“.

But there arose another party represented by the intellectuals of the new generation grown up under the influence of Count Széchenyi. The *Doctrinaires* or *Centralists* as they were called, were led by Baron Joseph Eötvös, the founder of the *Budapesti Szemle* (Budapest Review, 1840), the organ of the Hungarian intellectuals from 1840 to the present day. He was joined by the lawyer, Augustus Trefort, by the prominent historian, Ladislas Szalay, who took over the *Pesti Hirlap* in 1841 and by Anthony Csengery to whom he relinquished it in 1845. The Centralists had therefore two organs and their *Budapesti Szemle* as well as the *Pesti Hirlap* had a great circulation in the country.

The importance of the formation of a Centralist Party lay in two directions: firstly they had seceded from the Liberals and so public opinion was split in two; secondly, the Centralists had laid down the weapons of an unproductive policy of fulminant speeches and sought Western methods of Government.

especially those of centralized states instead of the many republics represented by the Counties.

The programme of the *Centralists* was laid down by Baron Eötvös in his work entitled *Reform* (Pest 1846).

44. Parliament was opened by King Ferdinand V. on the 12th November 1847 with a Hungarian speech.

The Government had a majority, but Palatine Archduke Joseph, the able leader of the Conservatives was dead and his successor, Archduke Stephen had only just been invested with the administration of Pest County on 16 October by the young Archduke Francis Joseph. It was therefore on Count Széchenyi that Prince Metternich relied, but he got in with great difficulty.

The leader of the Conservatives, Paul Somssich, rose for, and Kossuth against, the Government and on 27th November the Government was defeated by 26 to 22.

It was a fateful date for Prince Metternich, as from that day the Parliament was led by his greatest enemy, Louis Kossuth.

Count Apponyi, the nominal head of the Government, was lost, but the Prince did not give up the struggle. He retained the Chancellor and to the Opposition he gave concessions.

Kossuth however was working for a decisive victory.

On 15th December he said: „The war, Honorable States, is fought not between the Government and the Opposition, and not between the political parties of Hungary: it is fought between autocratic Austria and the constitutional nation of Hungary.”

On 5th February 1848 he added: „There will be no longer peace in the Parliament; there will be war until the last.“

A fortnight later Count Apponyi was dropped by the Government, but on the afternoon of 29th February a telegraph was sent over from Rothschild to Prince Metternich and „the coachman of Europe“ saw that the coach of Europe was overturned at Paris.

XII. The Revolution of 1848.

45. It was on the 3rd March 1848 that Kossuth rose for the last fight with Prince Metternich and delivered a speech ever memorable in history. Referring to the Western countries, where „famous thrones, up held by wisdom, had collapsed and peoples had regained their liberty“, he stated that „a noisome mist envelopes us and from the crypt of the Vienna government blows a wind that destroys our nerves and depresses our souls; the Dynasty must choose between its own welfare and the maintenance of a rotten Government. Bureaucracies and bayonet are miserable ties . . . and he will be the saviour of the House of Habsburg, who will reform the system of government in a constitutional direction and found the throne of his august House on the liberty of his faithful peoples“ After the speech he presented an address on the subject of constitutional Government.

On the 13th Prince Metternich and Count Apponyi fell; on the 14th the address was accepted by the Upper House; on the 15th the students at Budapest abolished the censorship and in their 12 points demanded Parliamentary Government; on

the 16th the delegation of the Parliament was received by King Ferdinand V. and on the 17th Count Louis Batthyány was nominated the first Constitutional Premier of Hungary.

On the 23th the list of the Government was ready and when on the 8th April it was published it was found to be a Coalition Government. The Premier Count Batthyány was a Liberal, as were Louis Kossuth (Finances), Francis Deák (Justice), Gabriel Klauzál and Bartholomew Szemere, Prince Paul Esterházy (Foreign Affairs) and Count Széchenyi (Communications) were Conservatives; Baron Eötvös belonged to the Centralists; General Lazar Mészáros was a soldier.

On 11th April the Constitutional Laws were sanctioned by King Ferdinand and Hungary became a constitutional kingdom.

On 25th April the Austrian Empire received its Constitutional Charter but everybody forgot that the Austro-Hungarian Union had not been dissolved and that nothing had been done towards a formal dissolution.

The Diet of Transylvania was opened on 28th May by the Royal Commissioner, General Baron Anthony Puchner, the Commander of the Imperial Corps at Nagyszeben, and on the proposition of the blind Baron Wesselényi the Union was unanimously proclaimed and the Roumanian people admitted as one of the legal nations of Transylvania.

One (Article VIII) of the Constitutional Laws of 11th April already declared the reunion of Transylvania, and so the united, historic Realm was restored and the period of provincialism came to an end.

Prince Metternich remarked later that by the Laws

of 1848 the *constitutio avita* of Hungary was buried ; but in reality it was only that the thousand-years-old Constitution had been adapted to modern ideas : it was only that the provincialism of his *Biedermeyer* autocracy had been swept away by the bloodless March revolution.

CHAPTER III.

War of Independence and Compromise with Austria. 1848—1871.

XIII. Rising of the Nationalities. March-August 1848.

46. The Revolution of 1848 ever remains one of the most interesting chapters of modern history, since the storm which broke out showed all the forces influencing the fate of Hungary.

We see the Constitutionalism of a historic nation reporting a bloodless victory after a bloodless Revolution, because it was only the finale of a period of reforms full of ideals and directed against nothing except oppression.

On the other hand we see the idealist leaders of 1848 giving themselves over to and regarding every thing with a childish joy and forgetting that life is above all a cruel reality.

If we accompany Joseph Blackwell, the British agent sent down to Pozsony from the British Embassy of Vienna to Count Batthyány, we find (as Blackwell found) the Premier in an astonishing optimism. Blackwell appreciated the victory, but he enquired about the new relations with Austria. He considered it necessary to make some concessions to Vienna

if Hungary wanted to retain connection with the king's other dominions. But the Premier smiled and said: „*Jamais*“. Blackwell's answer was the only alternative ignored by Kossuth's circle: „Then they must organise an army of a hundred thousand men without a moment's delay or they were lost“.¹

47. The Hungarian Cabinet list was not yet accepted by King Ferdinand V. and presented to Parliament, when on 21th March the Austrian Imperial Cabinet was appointed by Emperor Ferdinand I. Its President, Count Kolowrat was well known by his relation with the Nationalities in the last decade and it was suspected that he was the link between Prince Metternich or rather between the autocratic *Hofkriegsrath*, and the visible instrument of an invisible aulic circle led by Archduchess Sophie, the mother of the young Francis Joseph, where the secrets of Austrian Imperialism were deposited.

On the same 21st March a council was held, at which Ladislas Szögyény, since 14th March Royal Chancellor for Hungary, proposed the retention of the promulgation of the Royal Cabinet. His proposition was fully justified by the future, because the administrative separation of Hungary and Austria could only be effected by administrative way and administrative measures. But if he was right in his foresight, fully justified by the tragedy blown up by the coming storm of 1848, as well as by the Compromise of 1867, by the delay of the King's approbation he opened the way before the intervention of Count Kolowrat, who against the Constitution of Hungary appealed to the Nationalities.

¹ B Sz Vol. LXXXI. 1895. Pp. 233—34.

In the council held on 25th March following under the presidency of the Archduke Francis Charles, the husband of Archduchess Sophie, we see Baron Samuel Jósika, the Chancellor for Transylvania, to rise and propose the creation of an as he thought Pragmatic Army organised in both Transylvania and Croatia in the interest of the Court and with a front against Budapest. For Transylvania he offered full guarantees, as for Croatia, he proposed that Colonel Baron Joseph Jellachich should be nominated Banus and invested with full powers by the Court.¹

After the Conference the chancellors of Hungary and Transylvania parted as enemies, since Szögyény did not mind the setting up of the Nationalities in opposition against the Magyars, and he was embarrassed by Baron Jósika, who through either by his ignorance or his loyalism proposed an army uniting Magyars and non Magyars to march against the first constitutional and lawful Government of the Realm.

48. Both propositions were accepted, that of Szögyény's advising the retention of the Hungarian Cabinet list until the peaceful separation of the central administration, and that of Baron Jósika relating to the alliance with the Nationalities.

On the same 23rd March Palatine Archduke Stephen was telegraphed for to Vienna and in the night — without any advise given to the Hungarian Government — Colonel Jellachich was nominated Banus of Croatia.

The Royal Government of Hungary was not no-

¹ Sz E Vol. I. Pag. 65.

minated till the 8th April, and the Royal Chancery and the Hungarian governing bodies residing at Vienna were not dissolved till the 15th April.

On 6th April a Royal rescript, without the countersignature of a Minister ordered the taking over of the Austro-Hungarian debt (a sum amounting to ten million Austrian Florins), but though the first council of Ministers held under the Presidency of the Palatine pronounced it a private letter¹ it was already published in the Vienna Press by the Austrian Government.

On 10 May a formal note was sent on behalf of the Imperial Cabinet inviting to a common conference in the matters of the Civil List, Foreign Affairs, Commerce, Finances and the Army,² and on 23th May Francis Pulszky was delegated. He took up his residence in Vienna together with the Royal Minister of Foreign Affairs and of the Household, Prince Paul Esterházy, the late Ambassador at London, but at the Conference of 5th June the Austrian delegate appeared without instructions and Pulszky tendered his proposition in a Memorandum on 7th June.³

49. „The man who saved Austria“⁴ was a worthy man for a worthy nation. If this sounds curious it is not so from an impartial Hungarian point of view, as the Croats have ever been recognised as

¹ PE Vol. I Page 311. Published by PFH Vol. I. Pp. 48—49.

² Published by SZ Pp. 311—12.

³ Published *ibid.* Pp. 302—4.

⁴ A name applied to Baron Jellachich by his English biographer, E. Hartley: *The war who saved Austria.*

a nation; they fought side by side with the Magyars during many centuries against common foes and for common ideals, and Baron Jellachich himself was an ardent patriot.

His great mistake was that when on 25th March he was proclaimed at Zágráb, the Capital of Croatia, he accepted without the assent of the Royal Hungarian Government. He was not elected even by the wil. of the Croatian nation; he was simply an Austrian soldier appointed by the supreme War Lord of Austria to the command of an army to be formed against a sister nation before it had offered a friendly hand and a satisfactory Compromise to Croatia; it was the interference of the Austrian *Hofkriegsrath* in the affairs of Hungary. As a soldier, he was responsible to General Radetzky's headquarters at Milan; nevertheless he received his orders from the military cabinet of the Emperor and in civil matters he was instructed to seek assistance in Serb circles and in the Principality of Servia, all subservient to and useful for Austrian Imperialism.

And so „the man saved Austria“, but Croatia was — lost!

50 The *Hofkriegsrath* remained for ever the undivided, undissolved and omnipotent instrument of Austrian Centralism, the civil bureaus having all been given over to the Royal and Imperial Governments of Hungary and Austria.

The War Minister of Hungary had no real power in military matters, since all powers remained united at Vienna.

But Vienna was in a great embarrassment.

For two years the Government looked to Nicholas,

Tsar of all the Russias, who gave his full assistance to his brother of the Holy Alliance, the Emperor of Austria.

On 18th February 1846 General Collin occupied the independent Republic of Cracow, but on the 20th he was expelled by the population and a revolutionary Government was formed. On 5th March Russian troops appeared and on the 27th General Collin returned and accepted the Grand-Duchy of Cracow from the hands of the Russian.

51. Lord Palmerston was right in his remark that Russia had secret aims connected with the Cracow affair¹ and now we have other evidences of a close alliance between the weakest and the mightiest Empires of that period.

The American Minister at Vienna received information that the Vienna Government had acquired a loan from Russia in 1847, and thus the Russian alliance made it possible for Austria to prepare for the restoration of autocracy; but Russia prescribed also its direction, because by the assistance given to the weak the interest of the strong had a natural preponderance.

For two centuries Russia had a special interest in the Balkan Peninsula, the road leading to Constantinople, which since the wedding of Ivan III. of Moscow and of Princess Zoe Palaiologos, the descendent of the Greek Emperors of Constantinople solemnised at the Vatican in 1472, Tsarigrad was ever great goal of the Russians advancing to the Mediterranean.

The first station on that road was Roumania.

¹ LV Vol. II. Page 114.

known then under the names of the Danubian Principalities or Moldavia and Walachia.

For the Russians it was important to make them dependent on Russia; for the Magyars it was equally important to detach them from influence of the Slavs.

It was because of this that Latinisation was welcomed in both Hungary and Transylvania, and as early as 1843 blind Baron Wesselényi published at Leipzig his *Manifesto in the case of the Magyar and Slav Nationalities*. He desired a strong and Latin Roumania on the Southern Danube; an united Germany and her alliance with an united Hungary and Croatia, which would reunite her Dalmatian shore; and, last but not least, the independence of the Christian nations of the Balkan Peninsula.¹

52. The *Camarilla* of Vienna subverted this plan and worked on the dissolution of the secular union between Hungary and Croatia.

Baron Jellachich became the mere puppet of the military circles at Vienna. He was made Banus with a front against Hungary, — as on his Monument at Zágráb he is pointing his sword against Budapest, — and he refused even to take his official oath before the Royal Hungarian Chancellor.

The Royal Government ordered him for the 19th April to Budapest, and when no answer was received, by the 10th May the Palatine called him to obedience.² On the following day, 11th May, General Baron Joseph Hrabovszky, the Commander

¹ Ibid. Pp. 234—44.

² Published by PFH Vol. I. Pp. 89—90



of the Castle of Pétervárad, was sent out as Royal Commissioner for Croatia,¹ and on 14th May the Banus was prosecuted.²

But while the Hungarian General appeared without a Hungarian army at Ujvidék, on 15th May the Banus mobilised³ and summoned an independent sabor of 192 members representing not only Croatia, but also Slavonia, the Hungarian Counties laying on the Drave, the little peninsula bordered by the Drave and Mura Rivers, and Fiume.

The Palatine and the Premier now turned to the King. On 29 May the sabor was prohibited by King Ferdinand V⁴ and the Banus called to Innsbruck, where the Court found asylum against the revolutionary movement of the Capital, while the Royal decree of 10th June deprived Baron Jellachich of his dignities and solved the question of the Common Affair.

It was a great mistake that the decree was published by Pulszky in the Official Gazette, the *Közlöny* of Budapest and the *Wiener Zeitung*,⁵ the Premier Count Balthyány himself reading it with astonishment in those Papers. The Banus, procuring a *Wiener Zeitung* on his way to Innsbruck, read his sentence before the conference with the Royal Government could be held.

He was coldly received at Vienna and on 19th

¹ Published *ibid.* Pp. 92—93.

² Published *ibid.* Pp. 108—11

³ Published *ibid.* Pp. 112—15.

⁴ Published *ibid.* Pp. 159—60. l.

⁵ For Pulszky cf. *AE* Vol. XV.

June Archduke John was appointed to mediate between Hungary and Croatia, but as the Archduke left for Germany, the question remained unsolved and the Banus was swept off his feet by his military commanders towards a fateful war fought in the interest of Austria.

53. As a consequence of the Austro-Russian alliance, the Imperial Government was responsible for the second step also, the close alliance with the Serbs.

At the conference of the Serb population of Southern Hungary held at Ujvidék on 27th March,¹ a secret agent of Prince Alexander Karagyorgyevitch of Servia, the Dalmatian Mateja Ban, was present and counselled them to resist the Royal Government.² The agent of Ilja Garasanin, the Minister of Alexander Karagyorgevitch proceeded to Croatia, Dalmatia and Montenegro.

This was certainly an interference in the internal affairs of Hungary on behalf of a foreign state, but it remained an isolated case, as the Serb delegation got no answer from Louis Kossuth at Budapest. He was excused by the somewhat provoking manner of a member, the officer George Stratimirovich, but as a matter of fact, the delegation was left under the impression of a rupture instead of a fraternal union.³ By this rupture their loyalty as seth forth in the Memorandum they submitted to Kossuth: „Loyalty

¹ LMS Vol. CXLIII. 1885. Page 123.

² UJ Vol. I. Berlin 1921. Pp. 26—27.

³ Published at the P. H. No. 31, 16th April 1848. K. M. Vol. XI. Pp. 169—73 (the answer of Kossuth not fully published).

to the King, sacrifice in everything for the Fatherland, fraternal union with the Magyars —¹ was replaced by an union with the Austrian circles eager to make an alliance with the Serbs of Hungary, by them with Serbia and by the Principality with the Russian Empire.

54. As early as the 14th April another meeting was held at Karlóca, the seat of the Patriarch, where the Serbs voted for a separation of the Counties inhabited by the Serbs, viz. that of Szerém between the Drave and Save Rivers, of Baranya between the Drave and the Danube, of Bács Bodrog between the Danube and the Tisza and of Torontál and Temes between the Tisza and Danube.² On the 20th a third meeting at Ujvidék urged the convocation of the National Synod. Church and State in the Orthodox mind being bound together by the ties of visible and invisible forces, the demand amounted in a political aspect to a National Congress, to a national or constitutional assembly, to an act of self-determination and thus in its ultimate aspect to a revolution.

The revolution of the Serbs was welcomed by the Austrian Government and after the fateful rupture of 8th April everything turned for the worse for the Magyars, the Royal Government taking up a negative attitude and becoming step-by-step isolated while the inimical forces united and worked in a positive direction.

It was not possible for them to erect a formidable barrier in South Hungary,

¹ Published in the I. M. S. Vol. LXXXII. 1851 Page 111.

² Published by *ibid.* Page 120 P. F. Vol. I. Pp. 31—33. Cf. *Thim. op. cit.* Vol. I. Pp. 28—32 and B. Sö. Vol. LXXX. 1894. Page 71

On 13th May Josef Rajachich was proclaimed Patriarch and Stephen Suplikác, an Imperial General, the Vajda of the Serbs, the Synod relied on Belgrade and Vienna.

As for Vienna, on the 17th May the Croatian Ivan Kukuljevich, a friend of Baron Jellachich arrived to Karlóca and after the Croatian mobilisation (ordered for the 15th May) the Imperial Lieutenant George Stratimirovich, now head of the Serb civil government (odbor) called the Serbs to arms on the 24th May.

As for Belgrade the Servian Minister Ilija Garasani sent his agents as early as the 23rd March to Karlóca, in Hungary, to Zágráb in Croatia, and to Cetinje in Montenegro. After his election Patriarch Rajachich wrote to the Ministers of Prince Alexander Karagyorgyevich, „You were also there in spirit, and united your word with those of your brethren this side of the Danube. But for that we would not have gone so far“, and he asked for arms and munition⁴

The Austrian Consul at Belgrade, Colonel Mayerhofer, was instructed to place himself at the disposal of the Servian Government in its plans against Hungary, and so it happened that the Emperor of Austria openly promoted the intervention of a foreign Government against himself as King of Hungary.

Little Serbia had the same protector to whom the Emperor looked for assistance, Baron Jellachich was instructed to join the Serbs.

⁴ 28th May 1848. Zágráb. L. M. S. CXI- 1886. For particulars cf. Ungarische Jahrbücher Vol. I Berlin 1921. Pp. 22 et seq

Thus it happened, that on 5th June he opened an independent sabor at Zágráb, uniting all the Croats and Serbs of Croatia, Slavonia and Fiume, and that the Catholic Banus placed his official oath in the hands of the Orthodox Patriarch of the Serbs, Joseph Rajachich.

That the sabor was illegal was of no consequence for the Vienna Government had got a barrier against the separatist movement of Budapest, and because Article XX of the fundamental Laws accepted by the sabor endorsed the Austrian Centralism, „*Gesammtmonarchie — abgesonderte Administration und Gesetzgebung.*“¹

The barrier therefore was formed of the discontented Croats and Serbs led by the Imperial officers, Baron Jellachich, Stephen Supljikatz, George Strati-mirovich and Mayerhofer. It was done in the interests of the Vienna Court against Hungary, but as the Croats were forced to unite with the Serbs, the Serbs to rely on the Servian Principality, where the agent of Baron Jellachich (Ivan Kukuljevich) and that of Patriarch Rajachich met, and that Servia openly relied on the Russian Empire, and the Austrian Consul Mayerhofer was instructed to work hand-in-hand with his Russian colleague — the Southern barrier enjoyed a Russian protectorate.²

A Russian army on the Pruth stood ready for intervention.

The barrier was made by the autocratic military circles of Austria; the name Yougoslavia was no longer applied to it.

¹ Published by P. A. Pp. 25—125.

² M. H. R. Voll. II. Page 85.

55. The situation in Transylvania was similarly grave for the Royal Government.

On the 15th May a meeting was held at Balázsfalva where two parties of the Roumanian population fought against each other. The radical teacher Simon Barnatiu, wanted political independence, the Bishops John Leményi of the Catholic-Greek and Andreas Saguna of the Orthodox Greek Churches voted for the recognition of the Roumanians as a nation and for the autonomy of their Churches. Their proposition was accepted and sanctioned by the Diet of Transylvania.¹

Against reunion with Hungary the Orthodox Greek Bishop and his Lutheran colleague, Binder, the Bishop of the Saxons, appealed to the Court. On 4th June Binder and on 23th Saguna arrived at Innsbruck but they met the fate of Baron Jellachich. On 10th June the law of reunion was sanctioned by the King.

It is very interesting to note that the Saxons, who at the Diet of Nagyszeben voted for and at Innsbruck protested against the union, on the 20th June in a Memorandum declared their land „an indissoluble territory“, a state within the state.²

It was more noteworthy still that from Vienna the Roumanian delegation turned to „the sons of Traian and of the Corvins“, and claimed Transylvania by right of the Roman occupation.

¹ Protocol of the Balázsfalva Meeting was published by PFH Vol. I. Pp. 115—22. For particulars cf. B. Jancsó; op. cit. Vol. II. Pp. 456—81.

² Published by PFH Vol. I. Pp. 231—32. The Memorandum of 3 July *ibid.* Pp. 273—79.



Moreover both Saxons and Roumanians accepted the same instruction to form a barrier against the Royal Government of Hungary and the Saxon minister, Daniel Roth, endorsed the Daco-Roman theory together with the union of Transylvania, Moldavia and Valachia under the Imperial Crown of Austria (*Von der Union und nebenbei ein Wort über eine mögliche Dacoromanische Monarchie unter Oesterreichs Krone*. Published in May 1848) „We Saxons must join the Roumanian and the cause of the Magyars is lost. The German, Slav and Roumanian element will break through and destroy the Hungarian element. There will be a desperate struggle, but its end cannot be doubted“, was his opinion¹

And thus came into existence the anti-Magyar league of the Saxons and of the Roumanians relying on the Imperial Corps of Nagyszeben, on Vienna and on St. Petersburg.

Baron Wesselényi desired a strong policy on behalf of the Government and on 19th June Baron Nicholas Vay was nominated a Royal Commissioner for Transylvania.

In regard to the coming storm this amounted to nothing.

56. It was on the 5th July that the Parliament at Budapest was opened with 284 members representing Hungary and Transylvania.

The Government was late in everything.

It was only on 1st July that the speech from the throne was accepted by the cabinet and on the 10th that a Speaker was appointed in the person of Dénes Pázmándy.

¹ After B. Jancsó op. cit. Vol. II. Pp. 491—96.

On 11th July the Minister of Finance, Louis Kossuth rose in the House of Representatives and in an emphatic speech described the situation of the Government. "The nationalities had appealed to arms and turned to Austria; there is no hope of an arrangement with Austria; the Emperor has large forces in Italy and asks for Hungarian reinforcements, but if those reinforcements are sent the Fatherland will be defenceless against a general attack coming from any part of the great barrier between the Pruth and the Adriatic. He asked for the help of 200,000 Magyar soldiers and 40 million Florins and appealed to the Western Powers".

57. Viscount Palmerston keenly watched the Continental events, but he was not fortunate in his accounts, because he connected an independent Italy with a great and autocratic Austria as a barrier to Russian hegemony: the Russian hegemony was a fact, but Austria had become the vassal of Emperor Nicholas.

It was because of this that the Government of Hungary received no recognition or help from the British Government; that defeated Hungary became an oppressed land and a vassal state of Russia, which by her victories in Hungary and Germany became the arbiter of the fate of both Central and Eastern Europe.

There were three foreign policies affecting Hungary during the Revolution. The first was that of the Vienna Government; the second that of Prince Paul Esterházy, who as a former Ambassador at London became Minister for Foreign Affairs in the cabinet of Count Louis Batthyány, but remained with the Court as a Minister *à latere*; the third was

the Cabinet itself, inspired by the Minister of Finances, Louis Kossuth. The last named disposed of every important question and now turned with the optimism engendered by a victorious revolution to the liberal governments of England and France, ignoring the conservative manner of the foreign Chancelleries even under radical Governments.

It was Kossuth who invited the British Government to establish a British Legation at Budapest, but the letter of Count Batthyány was left unanswered¹ and Hungary was not recognised by England, as in Lord Palmerston's view, Austria had an Ambassador at the Court of St. James and he was unwilling to weaken Austria, his barrier against Russian hegemony, by the recognition of its other part as a sovereign state of Europe.

Kossuth's opinion about France, where Lamartine held the portfolio of Foreign Affairs, was based on the precedents of past Centuries, when he said: „France is far off. Poland had also French sympathies; the sympathy existed there, but Poland was lost“. As a matter of fact, there was some enthusiasm for Hungary in the democratic circles of France and Michelet at the College de France said: *La Hongrie, messieurs, espère aujourd'hui contre l'espérance. C'est qu'elle a la foi, et la foi sauve tout*, but Bastide and Drouyn de Lhuys remained indifferent.²

A greater role was reserved for Germany and Italy, the independence and national unity of both

¹ *Alter op. cit. Pp. 48 et seq. Sproxton op. cit. Pp. 38 et seq.*

² *Hermant op. cit. Page 351.*

countries being closely bound up with that of Hungary.

It was on the 14th May 1848 that Palatine Archduke Stephen and the Premier, Count Batthyány (and not King Ferdinand V) signed the credentials of Dénes Pázmándy and Ladislas Szalay, written by Louis Kossuth.¹ They left as the „*Regierungs-Bevollmächtigte*“ of Hungary. On 25th May their credentials were read in the Frankfurt Parliament and on the 29th they were received by Gagern, but the mission was not returned by Germany. However, Szalay recommended Prince Lichnowsky, the grandson of Count Charles Zichy, and the husband of Countess Eleonor Zichy for a German legation at Budapest. It is very curious that the instruction of the delegates, dated 24th May, was prepared by the Minister of the Interior, Bartholomew Szemere, who proposed German and British alliances: „A Slav Empire and the fall of the Hungarian state form an insuperable junction, and against that fall we must seek German and British alliances.“² The proposal of an alliance was accepted by the Parliament on 22th July following and by the Hungarian Parliament on 3rd August, but shortly afterwards the mission was recalled.

On 15th July 1848 Count Fedor Karacsy was sent to Stambul, but in the diplomatic circle of the Turkish capital he was condemned to inactivity.

58. Both the internal and the external policies of the Royal Government proved a complete failure and this failure was doubled by the uncertain relations between the Government and the Court in exile.

¹ Szalay op. cit. Page 5.

² Published at the B. Sz. Vol. XLIX. 1915. Pp. 254-55.

interrupted by Vienna, where the military circles had gained the ascendancy.

Austria survived the Revolution, thanks to the Czechs.

The leader of the Czechs, the historian Frantisek Palacky clearly saw that the German Empire, reconstructed on a national basis, was a great danger to his fatherland, Bohemia being a province of the German Confederation; but the Czechs were akin to the Slavs and the Slav minority was to be absorbed in the great German community.

It was because of this that he proposed not to send representatives to the German Parliament at Frankfurt, where Austria was to be represented and in which the Emperor of Austria was anxious to take the leading part.

Against United Germany he desired an independent and United Austria. „If that do not exist, it ought to be made“, was his famous watchword and he intended to unite all the Slavs around and in defence of Bohemia.

On this account he called together the Congress of the Slavs, which was held from the 2nd to 16th June at Prague, where all the Slavonic peoples were represented. It showed an united front against Germany, but the Slovaks did not join, and only the Croat, Kukuljevich, and the Slovak Stur spoke against the Magyars.

On 12th June a terrible battle arose around the Capital of the Czechs.

The Imperial troops of Prince Windischgraetz moved on the town; his wife was killed; Prague was taken by storm, the Czech national Government, formed on the 30th May under Count Thun and Palacky fell, and the latter joined the victorious

Austrian Empire as a counterbalance against United Germany.

From that day the Czechs also turned against the Magyars and Stur was sent to foment a rising in Upper Hungary with the aid of the Imperial forces stationed at Pozsony and Kassa, while Prince Windischgraetz's well equipped Army waited for the intervention.

59. After the success of the Royal Government at Innsbruck (deposition of the Banus, sanction of the Union with Transylvania) the proposition of 11th July proved a great embarrassment for the Cabinet.

The dilemma of either recalling or reinforcing the Hungarian troops on Italian soil, developed into a great danger.

On 21st July Kossuth openly confessed his sympathy for Italy, but on the following day Count Batthyány and Francis Deák declared it their private opinion that „if we recognise an independent Italy and this should be the consequence of the recall of the Hungarian forces, it would be an alliance with Ita'y against Austria; but on the basis of the Pragmatic Sanction Hungary cannot make an alliance against the Emperor of Austria“.¹ The forces to be sent to Italy were accordingly voted by 233 to 36 and on 27th July Pulszky urged the convocation of the Conference for the liquidation.²

But Deák's temperate proposition was already late.

Since 14th July a formal war had existed in Southern Hungary between the Royal forces of General Baron Philipp Berchtold and the Serbs backed by

¹ D B Vol. II. Page 94.

² Published by S. Z. Pp. 306-7.

Servia on the East and by Croatia on the West. Servia was represented by Stephen Knitchanin Petrovitch, sent by Prince Alexander and Croatia by the agents of Baron Jellachich. It was on the 28th August that the Premier, Count Batthyány, and the Minister for Justice, Francis Deák, were sent by the Cabinet to Vienna in order to ask for the sanction of the newly voted laws and to arrive at last at a Compromise with Austria, but on the 31st the King rejected all the propositions of the Government and on the advice of his military councillors he dissolved the Common affairs by a single decree.¹

The victorious Austrian Government turned to the Nationalities and to incorporate the Kingdom of Hungary into the Empire of Austria.

XIV. The Austrian Intervention.

September—October 1848.

60. Patriarch Rajachich, the dictator of the Serbs since 15th July was hardly able to avert the advance of the Royal troops which crossed the Maros and therefore he requested the Russian Consul Danilevskij to assist Servia in her intervention. Baron Radezky was to send home General Supphikatz, the military Governor of the Serbs. He asked also the assistance of Baron Jellachich, and was even ready to dissolve the Croato-Serb union in case the Banus should not declare war on Hungary.² Jellachich

¹ Published in the S. M. P. Pp. 1-23 and by P. F. H. Vol. Pp. 401-8. 1.

² L. M. S. Vol. CXI. 1866.

applied to the Austrian Government and on the 25th he was in possession of the permission.¹ He at once despatched General Roth to the Drave, and the sub-prefect of Zágráb County, Joseph Bunjevac, with Captain Vlach from the Imperial Army to occupy the only Hungarian seaport, the *corpus separatum*, Fiume.

It was on the morning of 31st August, when the fatal decrees of Innsbruck were dated and the Premier and Deák were en route to the king, that Bunjevac appeared with an Austrian officer on the little bridge of the Fiumara between the Croatian Susak and the Hungarian Fiume and sent an ultimatum to the Royal Governor, Count John Erdödy. The Governor called out the garrison, but he received an astonishing repudiation. After his departure, which meant evacuation, the *Congregazione* was replaced by a Croatian odbor, which took over the administration of the purely Italian town in the name of the *Ban* of Croatia.²

On the same day the Colonels Ernest Kiss and Anthony Vetter opened an attack against the camp of the Serbs at Perlasz and thus the first day of September saw the Empire of Austria and the Kingdom of Hungary once more opposed to each another.

61. On 1st September the Premier and Deák begged in vain for a compromise with the high circles of the Vienna Court, and they were unaware that on 2nd September, the morning of the brilliant victory at Perlasz, the ultimatum of the 31st August had already reached Budapest. On the 3th the

¹ B. Sz. Vol. LXXX. 1894. Page 215.

² A. E. Vol. XXIII. 1912. Page 454.

decrees have been sent to the Premier, but on the 4th Kossuth declared in Parliament that „the Government is unable to save the Fatherland.”¹

This was certainly a curious statement on the part of a Cabinet Minister, when the Premier was abroad, but the difference was widened on both sides and perhaps at the same hour Baron Jellachich was restored to his former dignities.²

After this great blunder Deák proposed to resign at once, but on the following day occurred a catastrophe that was held secret by every possible means: Count Széchenyi, the greatest Magyar lost his reason and was taken into the lunatic asylum at Döbling. On the 6th Prince Esterházy resigned and on the 10th the whole Cabinet followed his example.

On 11th Palatine Archduke Stephen accepted the resignations but he would entrust no one with the formation of a new Cabinet. Accordingly Kossuth pushed his ministerial chair to the Council table and declared: „I have resigned, but nevertheless I replace my chair and take my seat.” It was only in the night that Count Batthyány was nominated a second time but on the 22th King Ferdinand V. appealed to the Imperial Army and on the 25th he sent to Hungary another Premier in the person of Nicholas Vay, a Royal Commissioner in the person of Count George Majláth.

The Palatine Archduke Stephen recalled as early as the 22th August now left for Austria.

62. The enemies remained on the spot.

¹ P. M. N. Vol. II. Page 161.

² P. Page 130. S. M. P. Page 23. P. F. H. Vol. II. Page 1.

³ P. M. N. Vol. II. Page 168.

There was no longer a Palatine and an Archduke standing between the King and the Nation, and there was no longer a Government nominated by the King from the legal members of a legal Parliament.

There was, above all, no longer Count Széchenyi standing between Prince Metternich and Louis Kossuth.

There was a soldier sent by the Emperor of Austria as his commissioner for Hungary and repudiated by its legal Parliament, and there was a Minister who after his resignation replaced his chair and leaning on the sovereignty of the nation, took into his hand the government against the will of the lawful Sovereign.

There was an Imperial Army ready to invade and subdue a nation whose greatest ideal was its independence, and there was a nation defending himself until the last drop of its blood against oppression.

The moderates had no longer any weight in the scale.

A Royal letter of the 19th urged the acceptance of the Ultimatum of 31st August, and two days after the hurried decrees of 25th September Count Lamberg arrived at Budapest.

He took up his residence at Buda, while the Parliament met at Pest on the other side of the Danube.

For Budapest the situation was a desperate one, as Count Lamberg's power lay in Baron Jellachich, who after his Manifesto of 10th September — „Ich bin ein Mann Oesterreichs" —¹ and under Austrian flags the Austro-Croat forces on the 11th September crossed the Drave and reached Székesfehérvár without opposition.

¹ Published by P. A. Page 131-34.

The Banus now stood before Budapest and the rumour ran that he had brought the Royal Commissioner to the Capital. Count Batthyány, by a Royal decree of 15th September, again the head of the Royal Government, left for Székesfehérvár, but his departure left Kossuth sole master of the situation.

On 6th September he issued orders to print special Hungarian paper money without any agreement on the subject with Austria and on 11th September the relative ministerial order was sanctioned by Parliament. On the same day Ladislas Szalay was recalled by the Austrian Anthony Schmerling, but he was instructed by Kossuth to depart for London, while Count Ladislas Teleki was to take up his residence at Paris.

On 27th September Baron Jellachich's reports to Count Lalour,¹ the Austrian War Minister were captured and read, and at midnight Kossuth appeared armed with a sword and prohibited Count Lamberg from transacting official business.

On the following day the Count departed for Pest, but on the bridge was attacked and killed by the mob.

Consequently the King had no longer a representative in Hungary: his power had slipped into the hands of Kossuth. On the 29th a Committee of Defence (*Honvédelmi Bizottmány*) was formed and Count Batthyány left for Vienna to lay down his appointment as the first constitutional Premier of Hungary. (He resigned at Vienna on the 1st October.)

63. The 29th of September saw the scales turned in favour of Louis Kossuth.

¹ Published by P. M. N. Vol. II. Pp. 301-2 and P. F. H. Vol. II. Pp. 47-52.

General John M6ga, to whom the defence of the Capital had been entrusted, reported a definite victory near the village of Sukor6 (P6koz6-Velence) on the high road between Sz6kesfeh6rv6r and Budapest. Baron Jellachich turned to the West, while Kossuth at the head of his Government of Ironsides remained lord of the situation.

On 1st October the Banus retreated towards the Austrian frontier, seeking a junction with Count Latour, but as the rumour of his defeat had not arrived at Vienna, Count Latour on 2 October ordered the garrisons of Transylvania to join the Croats; and on 3rd October the Parliament was dissolved¹ and Baron Jellachich sent as a Royal Commissioner and Commander-in-chief to Hungary.²

Everybody believed he was at Budapest and it was only on the 6th October that the fateful defeat of the Imperialists was made public. On the same day a second Revolution broke out in the Austrian Capital and the Imperial Court fled to Olm6tz.

On 7th October the last division of the Banus laid down their arms at Ozora in Tolna County, and on 8th October the *Honv6delmi Bizottm6ny* took over the government as a regular body under the leadership of Louis Kossuth.

64. He fixed his eyes Austria, towards which Baron Jellachich, the supreme lord of Hungary fled with the remnant of his army, and he instructed Secretary of State Pulszky to arrive at an understanding with regard to the invitation of the victorious Hungarian army by the leaders of the Vienna Revolution.

¹ S. M. P. Pp. 6-8.

² P. A. Pp. 140-42. P. F. H. Vol. II. Pp. 69-71.

The Court however was not unprepared for emergencies.

On 16th October Prince Windischgraetz took over the command of the whole Imperial Army, — except that of the Army of Italy, which remained under Baron Radetzky — and for a time he took over the dictatorship in political matters also.

Austria was in a desolate position. War Minister Count Latour was hanged on a lamp — post in the street; the Minister of Foreign Affairs, old Baron Wessenberg, fled, on foot over the walls of the Capital; the Minister of Justice, Alexander Bach disguised in feminine attire could hardly reach the new military commandant of the town.

Prince Windischgraetz entered at the head of a victorious army uniting both German and Slav Loyalists. He was accompanied by his brother-in-law, Prince Felix Schwarzenberg, who took over the Centralist plan of Government worked out by Alexander Bach. In this plan we for the first time meet the name *Gesammtmonarchie* used for all countries united in the hand of the Habsburgs; there we see a *Gesammtministerium* surrounded by the *Landesminister* of Hungary, Croatia-Slavonia, the Serb Vojvodina and Transylvania; and last but not least, there we see the unity of the Army.¹

65. Pu'szky did his best, and while Kossuth and General Móza stood at Parndorf, whence the top of St Stephen's Cathedral was visible, the citizens of Vienna climbed to the roofs waiting impatiently for the Magyars to come to their rescue. But the leaders of the Revolution, and among them Robert

¹ Published by H. Friedjung op. cit. Vol. Pp. 489-90.

Blum, declined to assure responsibility for a Hungarian intervention and Pulszky escaped to Parndorf.

Kossuth himself took the lead, but his fiery speech could not help him over the barricades; and on the 30th October the battle of Schwechat was lost. Kossuth was too fatigued to stay up, and while he remained in bed, the Vienna garrison under Count Auersperg and the Croatian Army under Baron Jelachich joined the Prince, who on the 31st took the Capital. As General Móga lay ill at the Castle of Köpcsény, Kossuth entrusted the command to Colonel Arthur Görgey and gave the order for a general retreat.

66. The malign influence of the battle of Sukoró was seen on every battlefield.

In Southern Hungary Vajda Supljikatz at last arrived from Italy, but he was unable to check the advance of the Magyars, and Patriarch Rajachich turned to the Government of the Servian Principality and to Tsar Nicholas I.; „Would Russia permit” — he wrote — „the extinction of her Servian kinsmen? We should be satisfied with the bread falling down from his (the Tsar's) table and he could save us with one hand. Why does he not take us under his protection? I beg you to place before him our humble prayer that he should send us rifles, cannons, ammunition and money from Wallachia; that he instruct the Principality of Servia to help us, or that he mediate with the Hungarian Government that we may make an acceptable peace with the Magyars.”

On the occasion of the second meeting held at Balázsfalva in the second half of September the Roumanian population were formed into a *Populus*

¹ L. M. S. Vol. CXL. 1866.

Romanus and divided into 15 *legiones* under 15 *prae-fecti*, while the smaller units were commanded by *tribuni* and *centuriones*.¹ Their protest was welcomed by General Baron Puchner at Nagyszeben, with approval of III. §. „the Roumanian population desires to stand immediately under the emperor and his Imperial Ministry, at present under the military commander-in-chief“; and VI. §. „that it welcomes the Imperial Austrian Constitution and asks for its extension to Transylvania.“² The Austro-Roumanian alliance was promulgated on 9th October by the Manifesto of General Puchner,³ who on 18th became the Lord Lieutenant of Transylvania. The Saxons joined, and on 29th September placed the Saxon population under the *Gesammtministerium*.⁴

Kossuth had the military power to deal with Baron Puchner, but after the battle of Sukoro he was turned by invisible influence from his idealism towards Austria. He remembered the day in March when he arrived at Vienna with the delegation of the Parliament and by his brilliant oratory ruled the streets. Now he lay miserably collapsed in the neighbourhood of the Austrian Capital. His undrilled recruits collected on the Great Hungarian plain by his inspiring words swindled away. Before his mind's eye was a well equipped glorious army grown into immensity: behind him an impatient Capital, and behind Budapest the on-coming forces of Baron Puchner nearing Kolozsvár and the Királyhágó.

¹ B. Jancsó op. cit. vol. II. Page 590.

² Ibid. Pp. 592—93.

³ Ibid. Page 594.

⁴ TGS Vol. III. Page 254.

XV. The Austrian Invasion.

November 1848 — February 1849.

67. On the 6th November Prince Prince Windischgraetz was sent with full power against „the Hungarian rebels“ and this „second Wallenstein“ commenced his work in Austria. On 9th November Robert Blum, leader of the Francfort Parliament was executed; since 22nd October the Imperial Parliament had been transferred to the little town of Kremsier in Moravia, where on 22nd November it was solemnly opened by Prince Schwartzenberg since the 21st the new Premier of the United Empire of Austria. On the 27th he presented his programm: „Die Begründung eines neuen Bundes, das alle Bunde und Stämme der Monarchie zu Einem grossen Staatskörper vereinigen soll,¹ and on 2nd December the old King Ferdinand V. bound by his Coronation Oath to the historic Constitution of his Hungarian Kingdom, was replaced by the young Archduke Francis Joseph.

68. Kossuth sought peace through foreign connections,

On 14th November a captain of Hussars, Baron Louis Splényi presented his credentials at Turin, as Minister of the Committee of Defence, and proposed an alliance against Austria. The Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lorenzo Pareto asked in return that the Hungarian forces in Lombardy should be recalled and the Sardinian Government on 27th Decem-

¹ SMP Page 50.

ber despatched Colonel Alessandro Monti to Hungary.¹

Lamartine merely sent a secret agent in the person of Doctor Mandel, while the Minister designed for Hungary, Pascal Duprat remained at Paris²

The notes of Ladislas Szalay (12 November and 15 December) addressed to Lord Palmerston remained unanswered but he was indirectly informed, that „the British Government does not know a separate Hungary only as part of the Austrian Empire.”³

Late at night on the 2nd December 1848 William E. Stiles, the agent of the United States at Vienna, was sitting at his writing table, when a Hungarian Countess dressed as a peasant woman handed him a letter from Kossuth dated 29th November asking for his mediation in the interest of an armistice. Next morning Stiles went out to Schönbrunn, but Prince Windischgraetz answered: „I am going to occupy Hungary”.⁴ On 2nd February 1849 the American Secretary of State, Buchanan, forbade Stiles to take any further step in the matter.⁵

¹ E. Massari: *Ricordi biografia e carteggio di V. Gioberti*. Voll. III. Torino 1863. Pp. 309. et seq. His instructions are mentioned by D. Bianchi: *Storia della diplomazia di Europa*. Vol. VI. Torino 1868. Page 121.

² *Hermant op. cit.* Page 350.

³ Sproxton *op. cit.* Pp. 44 et seq. The documents were published by the Foreign Office: *Correspondence etc.* Nos. 78—82.

⁴ *Stiles op. cit.* Vol. II. Pp. 404-5. B. Sz. Vol. CVI. 1901. Pp. 161-66.

⁵ *Stiles op. cit.* Vol. II. Pp. 404-6.

69. On 15th December Prince Windischgraetz crossed the Leitha while on 18th at the head of a Northern Column General Wrba occupied Pozsony on the Danube. .

Görgey, the young General the Honvéds, moved southwards and on the right bank of the Danube retreated towards Budapest.

On 27th the Austrian Army of the Danube took Győr and in the closing days of the year it reached the range of mountains protecting the Capital from the West.

Count Batthyány, Francis Deák, the Archbishop of Eger, John Lonovics, and the *Judex Curiae Regiae*, George Majláth, appeared in the camp, but Count Batthyány was not even received by the Prince, who told the other deputies that he insisted on an „*unbedingte Unterwerfung*.”³ They were detained and together with the troops arrived at Buda. On the 8th January the command was transferred to Pest.

The Capital was empty; Government and Parliament fled to Debrecen. Count Batthyány retired to his palace, but in the night he was taken to a military prison.

The Imperial Army was drawn up in the form of a fan round Budapest from the Mátra mountains in the North to Szolnok in South East and over Cegléd towards the Danube in the South.

It faced the Tisza river and Debrecen, where everything lay in silence.

-70. Meanwhile the Army of General Görgey crossed the Danube via the Capital and at the head of his Upper Danube Army followed the courses of the Danube and the Vág Pursued by three Austrian divisions he took the Branyiszko Pass by force and

on 10th February appeared at the headquarters of the Austrian General Schlick at Kassa. Following the Hernád river he safely reached the Upper Tisza.

There a decisive battle had just been fought between the Austrian and the Revolutionary Armies.

The former was led by Prince Windischgrätz, the latter by Joseph Dembinsky, a Polish General invited by Louis Kossuth on the recommendation of his friend and envoy at Paris, Count Ladislas Teleki.

The choice was an unfortunate one, the general being already an old man, and above all a foreigner entirely unacquainted with the territory and the people.

After the defeat of General Móra Kossuth seemed it necessary to entrust the supreme command to an experienced though foreign General, who enjoyed the respect and confidence of the younger Hungarian colonels valiantly fighting at the head of their well drilled Honvéd battalions.

But Dembinsky had no respect at all among the men; neither had he any knowledge of the various factors which are necessary to victory; above all, his strategy was bad.

He was fortunate only in that Prince Windischgrätz' strategy was worse and so the battle of Kápolna, fought by absolutely weak brigades was on the 28th given up as hopeless.

Both generals were troubled about its result; the Prince however reported a great victory over the main army of the rebels, who were driven back and lost from sight.

As a matter of fact, the battle proved a decisive one in the history of the Austrian Winterfeldzug (Winter Campaign).

71. In Southern Hungary on 1st November Colonel John Damjanich took over the command; on 9th December he took the camp of Lagerdorf and on 12th that of Alibunár.

After the loss of Budapest the Honvéds retired to the northern bank of the Maros, while the Serbs under General Teodorovitch and the Servian Knitchanin occupied the Banate as far as the Southern bank of the river. At the conference of 9th and 10th February held at Temesvár, the command was transferred to Baron Rukavina, the local Commandant and the Servian Government bitterly felt that „the Serb army had step-by-step lost its national character and become an Austrian Southern Army, responsible no longer either to the odbor or the Patriarch, but to the Austrian Generals; it receives its pay from and fights for Austria.”¹

On 28th February Knitchanin crossed the Danube and retreated to Servia.

72. While the Government relied on the Tisza in the North, and on the Maros in the South, Kolozsvár behind Debrecen was occupied by General Puchner.

Kossuth sought another man for the command of the army in the mountains between Hungary and Transylvania and found another Pole, Joseph Bem recommended by Francis Pulszky and sent over from Vienna to Hungary after the battle of Schwechat.

On the 1st December therefore Bem was invested with the command and on the 25th December Kolozsvár was again in his hands. A week later he took Beszterce and Naszód in the North, on 12th

¹ Opinion of John Rustitch. H. Vol. VI. 1886. Page 761.

January occupied Marosvásárhely, and on 21th he stood before Nagyszeben, which was at once evacuated by Baron Puchner.

A fortnight after this events, he was face to face with two Russian armies which had crossed the Carpathians.

XVI. The shadow of Russia.

1848—1849.

73. Russia mobilised after receipt of the first news of the February Revolution and Emperor Nicholas called to war „every faithful Russian.” „Every faithful Russian,” — said the Imperial Manifesto of 26th March 1848, — „respond with joy to the call of his Sovereign. Our old battle cry: „For the Faith, for the Tsar and for the Fatherland” points the way to victory, where once arrived, we shall all give H.m thanks. Peoples of the world! You should follow the word of God, Who is with us.”

When the Great Powers affected by the Revolution collapsed, the Tsar first turned his attention to Stambul and as early as 16th March he despatched General Duhamel to the Danubian Principalities. After the Roumanian Revolution had on succeeded, the Russian consul, Kotzebue, returned to Russia and on 31st July the Russian Chancellor, Count Nesselröde, informed the foreign governments of Russian intervention in the Principalities. On the same day General Alexander Nikolajevich Lüders crossed the Pruth and short'y afterwards the Russian Army stood on the Southern slopes of the Carpathians.

74. In consequence thereof the Russian advance

and the hope of Russian assistance at one stroke put life into the Austro-Slav barrier erected on the Southern frontiers of the lands of St. Stephen and also into Austria.

Since 1847 the Empire had depended more and more on Russia. Russia gave a state loan to the Vienna Government and after the collapse of the Austrian Power prepared her way towards Constantinople.

For that purpose the assent of Austria was required and it was this that she determined to restore to its former dignity by her own bayonets surrounding the Carpathians from Cracow to the Danubian Principalities, where General Lüders stood with a Russian Army, and also to Serbia, where Belgrade became the centre of a strong Russian propaganda.

The Austrian Government accepted the assistance and relied more and more on the Russian Empire and when young Francis Joseph ascended the throne, his father, Archduke Francis Charles proceeded to St. Petersburg, where the utmost assistance was promised.

75. It was therefore a grave mistake of Louis Kossuth that in his desperate fight on the Austrian frontier he took the Polish emigrants into the pay of Hungary and that he entrusted to them the highest command in both Hungary and Transylvania. Count Joseph Bem were able Generals, but their presence was equivalent to Polish intervention and it was the immediate cause of another intervention on the part of Russia, the old enemies of 1831 thus meeting again on the devastated plains of Hungary. „L'insurrection soutenue par l'affluence de nos traîtres de la Pologne de l'année 1831 a donné à la

révolte une extension de plus en plus menaçante," said Tsar Nicholas in his manifesto of May 1949 to the People of All the Russias¹ and he wrote to Marshal Prince Paskievitch: „Dans le soulèvement hongrois on voit de toute évidence les intentions coupables du complot général ourdi contre tout ce qui est sacré, et sur-tout contre la Russie, parcequ' à la tête du soulèvement se trouvent leurs éternels ennemis, les Polonais."²

76. After the departure of Archduke Francis Charles alarming news came from the Danubian Principalities.

General Alexander Nikolajevitch Lüders reported the advance of a Polish-Hungarian Army led by General Bem against Nagyszeben and the Principalities.

At a conference of the Saxon and Roumanian authorities, General Pfersmann, an Austrian General, and the Orthodox Greek Bishop Saguna, neither of them a Transylvanian, proposed to send Saxon and Roumanian delegations to Bucarest and on 31st December the Bishop and his friends left for Wallachia. General Lüders had no instruction whatever, but when on 18th January General Bem appeared before Nagyszeben, Baron Puchner himself fled to Wallachia. On the 21th an Imperial order arrived from St. Petersburg and on the 23rd the Russians moved in the direction of the Carpathians.

General Enge'hardt arrived on 2nd February to Brassó and General Skariatín on the 4th to Nagy-

¹ Hermant op. cit. Page 326.

² Quoted from Scherbatoú's life of Prince Paskievitch, Vol. VI. *Revue de Hongrie*. Vol. IX. 1912. Page 212.

szeben, only to be hurled back on 20th March by General Bem.

Viscount Palmerston in his note of 26th February protested in vain against the Russian intervention. But as he was on the side of Austria, the ally of the Russians, the Magyars were left to their fate.

XVII. Liberation of Territory.

March — May 1849.

77. The shadow of Russia disappeared for a moment before the lightning of the brilliant campaign of the Hungarian Army.

On 1st March, when the rumour of the great victory of Kápolna reached Vienna, the situation was as follows:

Prince Windischgraetz moved slowly towards the Tisza; old Dembinsky on the 2th crossed the River and retreated towards Debreczen. A military revolution broke out and the young generals opposed the Pole, who on the 3rd was replaced by the able General Anthony Vetter.

On the same day the Southern Army of Damjanich which had started on 1st March neared Szolnok, where the 5th General Kager's Imperialists were defeated and the town was carried by storm by the Honvéds.

78. Szolnok was an important place for the Prince, and its loss at once counterbalanced the famous Constitutional Charter of United Austria promulgated by his brother-in-law, Prince Schwartzenberg on the previous day.

The Charter of the 4th March was a declaration

of war to the Germans of Austria who desired union with Germany; to the Czechs who on the ruins of their dreams of federation were incorporated into autocratic Austria; and to the Magyars, who simply lost their independence.¹

But Kossuth went further.

On 31st March he entrusted the command to General Görgey, who abandoned the slow tactics of Fabius Cunctator and on the 3rd April attacked the Austrians on the northern end of the front. After a brilliant victory he turned to the South-west, and on the following day the battle of Tápió-Bicske was fought, where Baron Jellachich was defeated by the Honvéds. On the 6th Görgey attacked the Prince at Isaszeg and with great loss broke through the Imperialists' line.

On the 10th Damjanich took Vác and reached the Danube. On the 12th the defeated Prince was superseded by Baron Welden, and early in the morning of the 14th he received the relative order of his sovereign Lord.

On that day Kossuth collected his rump Parliament at the Reformed Church of Debreczen and declared the House of Habsburg deposed. The House of Magnates was represented by one man; the galleries however were full of people from the town, and these proclaimed him Governor of Hungary.

The second Governor of Hungary (the first being Joh Hunyadi elected in 1440) offered the Premiership to Bartholomew Szemere, who on the 1st May formed a new Cabinet, of which Count Széchenyi

¹ Published at SMP Pp. 48—71.

and Francis Deák were no longer members; it was rather a Government chosen from the personal friends of the Governor.

The fatal step was crowned by two especial faults.

The one was that the moderate elements headed by Deák, retired and remained faithful to the Laws of 1848 and that the Conservatives offered their good services to the uncrowned king Francis Joseph with a view to a restoration on the lines of 1847.

The other was that Kossuth in his blind idealism placed the Polish eagle on the Hungarian coat-of-arms. Old Metternich in his exile predicted that this step would lead to open war with Russia.¹

79. The glorious army nevertheless liberated the whole territory from the foreigners.

On 11th March Nagyszeben was retaken by General Bem; and Baron Puchner together with General Skariatin (by the Pass of Vöröstoron), and General Heydte together with General Engelhardt (by the Pass of Törösvár) fled to Wallachia.

On the 27th Ujvidék and Pétervárad were occupied by General Maurice Perczel and on the 3rd April the whole Austro-Serb Army collapsed at Szenttamás.

On the 17th General Bem appeared in Karánsebes and on the 19th he took Lugos.

On the 26th Komárom was taken and Baron Welden withdrew his forces to Pozsony.

On the 10th Pancsova and on the 15th Orsova were occupied and on the 21st fortress of Buda was stormed by the Honvéds.

In the whole Hungary only Gyulafehérvár in

¹ N. P. Vol. VIII. Page E1.

Transylvania, Temesvár in the Banate and Pozsony on the West retained their Austrian garrisons.

80. Kossuth was now at the height of his power.

His fatherland was free and he revived his great designs in order to guarantee its independence.

He desired to restore General Dembinsky to his former dignity and to send him out with a Polish-Hungarian force to liberate Poland from the yoke of Russia: a step tantamount to declaration of war on the Russian Empire.

But the Governor got now encountered formidable opposition in the army, which under its ambitious commander-in-chief, General Görgey, was not disposed to follow the way of designs as dangerous as they were seemed futile.

He opposed Kossuth on the question relating to the King. At the headquarters at Gödöllő these two great men of the Revolution came for the first time face to face.

Kossuth in an eloquent speech informed the General that England, France, Italy, Turkey and Germany were only waiting until the independence of Hungary should be declared and they would give assistance at once; that the Polish nation would follow the example of Hungary, and there would then be an alliance with Poland against Vienna in the West and Petersburg in the East. Our Fatherland can only be saved by deeds and not by words" — replied Görgey — „and for those deeds we must look to nobody except ourselves. On the contrary, whole armies will be set in motion to prevent this, since a glorious Polish-Hungarian alliance would disturb the balance of power in Europe.”¹

¹ GEM Vol. II. Chapter 3. Kossuth at Gödöllő. Pp. 8—13.

The General declined to accept the Ministry of War offered to him in Szemere's Cabinet: he preferred to remain at the head of his faithful Honvéds. This terrified the friend of Kossuth.

The leadership of public opinion now fell upon Francis Deák, who had retired to his little estate in Zala County on the Austrian frontier, while the Governor's hopes lay in Europe. But his Paris envoy, Count Teleki was like himself, an ardent Radical, who despised the Government of the French Republic and attached himself to its radical opposition, to Ledru-Rollin and his radical friends immigrated from Germany, Italy, Poland and Russia, this friendship destroying all hope of an assistance on behalf of France. Lord Palmerston remained as cold as ever and worked for a stronger Austria in order to avert the Russian preponderance. The dictator of Venice, Daniele Manin made an alliance with Kossuth on 3rd June at Ancona, but Venice was surrounded by Baron Radetzky's Imperialists. On 18th June the United States sent out a Minister in the person of A. Dudley Mann, he however never reached Hungary.¹

Kossuth had alone to face the Austro-Russian alliance.

XVIII. The Russian Invasion.

1849.

81 On the 5th April it was reported by Sir Robert Buchanan, the British Ambassador at the Russian Court, that the rôle played by Bem and Dembinsky,

¹ His papers were published by the Senate: *Affairs of Hungary, 1849—50*. Washington 1910.

the Polish Generals of the Revolution of 1830—31, now in the pay of Hungary, probably would lead to the armed intervention of Russia.¹

This intervention was made public on 1st May in the official *Wiener Zeitung* at Vienna and on 11th May in the *Gazette de St. Petersbourg* at the Russian Capital.

On the 3rd Baron Welden was replaced by Baron Julius Haynau notorious for his severity at Brescia in Italy.

On the 9th an Imperial Manifesto was published in Petersburg² and on the 12th another at Schönbrunn in Austria.

On the 19th the young Emperor Francis Joseph met Tsar Nicholas I. at Warsaw and a treaty of intervention was concluded between the two Empires.³

On the 21st intervention was officially notified to Lord Palmerston by Count Colloredo and on the 22nd by Baron Brunnow, the Russian Ambassador. The British Premier was surprised, and he protested, but he left Hungary to her fate because, in his opinion, „Austria stands in the centre of Europe, a barrier against encroachment on the one side and against invasion on the other. The political independence and liberties of Europe are bound up with the maintenance and integrity of Austria as a compact European power . . . Every field that is laid

¹ Correspondence etc.

² Published by P F H Vol. II. Pp. 434—35.

³ Made on 10th June and published by *Martens* in his *Nouveau Recueil* etc. Vol. IV. Pp. 580—601 and by *Neumann* in his *Austrian Recueil de traités* Vol. V. 1859. Pp. 63—83.

waste is an Austrian resource destroyed, every man that perishes upon the field in the Hungarian ranks, is an Austrian soldier deducted from the defensive forces of the Empire."¹

In June 200,000 Russians crossed the Carpathians.

82. On the 3rd June General Paniutin joined forces with Baron Welden at Nagyszombat, on Hungarian soil.

On the 9th June General Sass occupied Árva County in the North, while Tsar Nicholas I., personally reviewed the army of Prince Ivan Feodorovitch Paskievitch crossing the mountains of Szepes, Sáros and Zemplén Counties. The Generals Lüders and Grotenhjelm were entrusted with the occupation of Transylvania.

Tsar Nicholas proceeded to „l'extinction d'un incendie qui menace de se propager du Danube à la Vistule”² and thus he opened the way to Constantinople through the alliance with weak Austria. As early as 1st May he made an arrangement with Turkey for the occupation of the Danubian Principalities.³

83. The Revolutionary Army stood as follows.

Commander-in-Chief General Görgey faced the Austrian forces in the West; his Polish rivals. General Dembinsky and later on General Wysocky organised an army for Poland in Upper Hungary; General Bem had returned to Transylvania.

Kossuth in his protest of 18th May from Debre-

¹ Lord Palmerston in the House of Commons. 21st July 1859.

² 16th June 1849. Published by *Hermant* op. cit. Pp. 525—28.

³ Published by *Martens* op. cit. Vol. XIV. Page 378.

cen, and with his Manifesto of 28th June from Budapest, in vain turned to Europe.¹ In reality he clearly saw that from the West nothing could to be hoped for, and in June Count Juhus Andrassy was sent to Constantinople.

The Government had now a sounder plan and turned to the Nationalities.

While the Czechs offered their services to the Austrian Court and through it to Holy Russia, he asked the Servian Government for a compromise, General Perczel managing the transaction from his headquarters at Pancsova. Count Andrassy called upon the French Consul Ségur at Belgrade, took the demands of Ilija Garasanin at the French Consulate and conveyed them to Budapest.² With the Roumanian Balcescu an arrangement was made on 14th July at Szeged, where on 28 a new Law regarding the Nationalities was passed;³ all however was frustrated by the advance of the Russians.

84. On 24th June Prince Passkievtch stood at Eperjes and General Wysocky retired southwards to the Great Hungarian Plain.

Two days later, on the 26th a Cabinet meeting was held and Görgey asked the Government to join the command of the Army. He proposed a concentration on the right bank of the Danube, a short campaign against the Austrians and a diplomatic transaction with the Russians.⁴

¹ Published by PFH Vol. II. Pp. 450—61 and 486—90.

² On Count Andrassy's action of Wertheimer op. cit. Vol. I. Pp. 26 et seq.

³ Published by PFH Vol. II. Pp. 526—28.

⁴ SEM Vol. II Page 167.

But two days later, on the 28th Russians crossed the Danube and Győr was occupied.

On the 29th Kossuth gave up the Capital and on 1st July he appointed General Mészáros Commander-in-Chief.

This step amounted to Civil war, as Görgey was unwilling to vacate his post and he defied the Civil Government.

On the 13th he left Komárom in charge of General George Klapka and breaking through the Russian line safely led his army via Vác to the Tisza River. There he learnt that since the 30th the Pole Dembinsky had again been the Commander-in-Chief.

85. Count Dembinsky accompanied Kossuth to Szeged and on the day following his appointment, on the 31st, started for Arad on the right bank of the Maros, but on the 5th August he lost a battle near the village of Szőreg.

On 26th July Nagyszeben and on 29th Segesvár were occupied by the Russians and Bem lost another battle on the 31st at Segesvár, where Alexander Petőfi the great poet fell. Without an army the old General fled towards the Banate to meet his compatriot. There he was appointed Commander-in-Chief in lieu of Dembinsky. But neither of them had an army, neither of them had a plan of campaign and both were foreigners!

86. On the 8th August the only man who could make a concentration arrived at Arad, but Dembinsky was soon pressed to a battle by baron Haynau.

At the Cabinet meeting of the 10th Kossuth announced a brilliant victory and presented his decrees relating to his Poles, while General Görgey was called upon for an explanation.

There was dead silence.

On the same night General Görgey at length relinquished his command; but on the 11th however Kossuth offered him full power on the difficult condition that he should bear full responsibility if he failed to use his power to save the fatherland. What he meant by this cryptic utterance, he never told to any one.

Görgey had only thirty two thousand tired men at his disposal; the battle of Temesvár was lost, and the Poles together with the Governor were fled to Turkey.

During the night Görgey sent a message to the Russian General Count Fedor Vasiljevitch Rüdiger to the effect that he was ready to lay down his arms; and the surrender took place at Világos on the 13th day of August 1849.

From Turkey Louis Kossuth denounced him as a traitor and held him responsible for the fall of the country (The so called *Letter from Viddin*, 12 September 1849).

Austria was saved and Hungary lay at the feet of Russia

XIX. Absolutism.

1848—1860.

87. The new order had its many problems

Austria was saved by a Slav Power. She had however a thoroughly German Government; and she had a numerous Slav population, many Italians, in Hungary, and in Croatia many Magyar inhabitants.

None of the races counted a majority, but it was evident, that in the aggregate the Germans and the Slavs had a dominating position.

The Germans had the power in their hands, but this power seemed only nominal, since the German government had a Russian overlord, and Russia favoured the union of her Slavonic brethren. Frantisek Palacky alone seemed to enjoy the fruits of the victory, because the Magyars were given over to a German government; the Germans of Austria were forbidden to unite with Germany, as that would be fatal for Bohemia. Austria remained a separate state weakened by Austro-Prussian, Austro-Russian and Austro-Hungarian differences: Palacky now proposed the union of the Slavs of Austria in order to arrive at a majority.¹

88. The government of Prince Schwartzenberg did not trouble itself with these questions: its only policy was blind revenge.

While his brother-in-law, Prince Windischgraetz, took advantage of the split arisen from the radicalism of Kossuth, from the creation of his Committee of Defence and his retirement to Debreczen, and established connection with the Conservatives led by Count George Apponyi, who offered him the good services of his friends; the Privy Councillor Ladislav Szögyény on the 12th January was appointed chief of the *Provisorische Landesverwaltung*. In his administrative reconstruction, Prince Schwartzenberg replaced the Prince by Baron Welden and later by Baron Haynau. Szögyény resigned and the Conservatives gave way to an absolutist régime.

89. The policy of revenge started in three directions.

By the new rulers personal revenge was held the

¹ Narodne Noviny, No. 23, December 1849.

most important and on 1st September the „*Hyena of Brescia*“ called on enemy man employed since the 3rd October 1848 in any office civil or military.¹

On the 5th October Komárom, the last fortress opened its gates to the enemy. On the 6th October the remaining twelve Generals of the victorious Honvéd Army were hanged at Arad, and Prince Metternich heard with astonishment in his exile that on the same day Count Batthyány was shot in a Budapest barracks.

These martyrs were followed by Baron Sigismund Perényi, President of the Upper House and by many others, until after the execution of hundreds of innocent and able men, Baron Haynau was dismissed² and the young Emperor amnestied nearly all the other imprisoned statesmen.

Shortly after his dismissal Baron Haynau visited England, and in London he was severely handled by some workmen and women who recognised him. Count Colloredo, the Austrian Ambassador appealed to Lord Palmerston for redress, but the Foreign Secretary advised him not to bring the case before the Court, as to do so would only result in further humiliation for Baron Haynau.³

90. The second part of the revenge was the partition of the lands of St. Stephen and the introduction of German administration, of German officials and soldiers, and of the German language in every *Kronland* without respect to the Nationalities.

¹ SU Page 155.

² Wiener Zeitung 8 June 1850.

³ 10 October 1850. Lord Palmerston to George Grey. AP Vol. I. Pp. 239—240.

Thus both allies and enemies of Prince Schwarzenberg received the same Germanisation.

On the 16th October United Austria was divided into 4 Army Commands: I. Austria-Bohemia, with headquarters at Vienna: II. Tirol, Italy, Illyria, with headquarters at Verona, III. Hungary-Transylvania with headquarters at Buda, IV. Galicia-Bukovina with headquarters at Lemberg. Frantisek Palacky retired into private life.

On the following day (17th October) Hungary was divided into 5 military and 13 civil districts and from 19th December 1848 was included in the Austrian custom limits.¹

The administration was as follows: the *Kronland* had a *Landeschef*, the *Kreis* various *Kreisbehörden* and the *Bezirk* various *Bezirksämter*.

Transylvania became a separate *Kronland* governed by General Baron Louis Wohlgemuth, who partitioned the land into 6 military districts. The Saxons lost their historical autonomy,² the Roumanians were disarmed and their leader, Avram Iancu became a lunatic. In Southern Hungary a Serb *Vojvodina* was erected by the Imperial Patent of 15th December 1849, but General Mayerhoffer introduced a purely German military Government. Above all the *Vojvodina* had no definite frontiers and both *Rajachich* and the *Servian Principality* broke away from Austria.

Croatia was left to Baron Jellachich, but the „man

¹ S. Z. Pp. 180—81. Accepted on 8 June 1849. Ibid. Pp. 182—85. and sanctioned on 7 June 1850. Ibid. Pp. 193—96. *Friedjung* op. cit. Vol. I. Pp. 299—300.

² T. G. S. Vol. III. Pp. 295—99.

who saved Austria" fell into despair when Croatian autonomy was replaced by German administration.

Fiume was not separated from Croatia, though it received German Governors.

Thus the second part of the revenge was an Austrian autocracy based on Germanisation, a common danger to all its people.

91. But Austria was only saved by (as in foreign relations it remained in the shadow of) Russia, the protector of the Slava.

Lord Palmerston was extremely struck by the news of Világos;¹ he was satisfied however with the victory of Austria; in the Russian advance he saw the subversion of the balance of power in Europe.

From that sorrowful day of the 13th August 1849 he opposed Russia on every side, and step-by-step supported Austria.

He clearly saw the vanity of the Austrian Power and he was told that even on the medal struck to commemorate the victory, the Austrian coat-of-arms was shown as under the protecting wings of the Russian eagle.

When Baron Stürmer and Titoff, the Austrian and the Russian Ministers of Stambul, demanded the extradition of the Hungarian and Polish emigrants, and the *divan* of 8th September might unwillingly have had through weakness to give way before the ultimatum, the British Cabinet Council held on the 2nd October strengthened the hands of the Porte, and the Mediterranean Fleet was placed at the disposal of the British Minister Sir Stratford Canning, to enforce his protest against the demand.

¹ N. P. Vol. VIII. Pp. 64—65.

On the 28th October Admiral Parker appeared in the Dardanelles and on the 7th November the Austro-Russian Entente withdrew its demand for extradition. The Hungarian emigrants were safe.

92. The emigration began on the 14th August when General Perczel crossed the frontier at Orsova; on the 15th he was followed by Generals Dembinsky and Mészáros; on the 16th the Crown of St. Stephen was buried in a little wood near Orsova and on the 17th Kossuth, his Premier, Szemere and his foreign minister Count Casimir Batthyány left Hungary; on the 24th General Bem crossed the frontier.

The emigrants were conveyed to Widdin on the Danube, thence to Shumla, and in February 1850 to Kutahia in Asia Minor.

In September 1851 the interned became free; and on the invitation of the United States, Kossuth on the 11th left aboard the frigate *Mississippi* for America. He was warmly welcomed in England (in Southampton and at the Guildhall in London) and also in America, where on the 2nd January 1842 he was received by Congress.¹

Count Andrassy settled in Paris and together with Count Teleki they joined President Bonaparte, who became the champion of European liberty against Russian domination.²

93. The Hungarians as well as the Nationalities welcomed the Crimean War which struck a fatal blow at the Austro-Russian Alliance.

¹ For particulars cf. *Pulzky's Memoirs* Vol. II Pp. 65 et seq. and *Berzevitzky op. cit.* Vol. I. 1922. Pp. 370—429.

² For particulars cf. *ibid.* Pp. 387—407. and *E. Wertheimer op. cit.* Vol. I.

Deprived of Russia, the Austrian Empire was bound to collapse, and its fall was hastened by the national movements around its Western and Southern Frontiers.

The change commenced in the Danubian Principalities where between 1856 and 1860 a national State, present day Roumania, was formed.

It continued on the Southwest, where Savoy declared war and Lombardy, Middle and Southern Italy were liberated in 1859-60.

And it finished in the West, where an United Germany arose and Austria lost her German territories together with the hegemony of the German States.

For the welfare of her peoples she was detached from both Russia in the East and Germany in the West and finding nowhere else a protector she was obliged to appeal to her own population.

94. We will record the chief events of the decade (1851-60) which preceded Austria's reconstruction.

The Conservatives led by Count Emil Dessewffy worked hard for the Constitution of 1847, in which during centuries a *Real-Union* had been embodied with Austria. Count Széchenyi after a bitter denunciation of Austrian oppression (Blick. London 1859) shot himself at Döbling asylum.

Deák, the liberal leader of the period of reforms and the minister of 1848 adhered to the Constitutional Laws of 1848 and worked for a *Personal-Union* to be embodied in a Compromise with Austria frustrated in 1848 by the Austrian Government. He retired into private life, but was backed by the public opinion of his country.

Both groups unable to win over the Court of

Vienna but after the crushing defeats suffered in Lombardy in 1859 the dominating position of Austria was badly shaken. She had no longer old Prince Metternich with his great experience, nor Prince Schwarzenberg with his domineering manner. The Imperial Government sought a connection with the Conservatives and event followed on the heels of each other.

95. The Lord Lieutenant, Archduke Albrecht, was replaced by General Louis Benedek.

The Conference of 15th August 1859, between Minister Count Rechberg and the Conservatives, proving a failure, by the Imperial Patent of 5 March 1860 a *verstärkte Reichsrath* was created, uniting the extreme Conservatives of the *Kronlands*. Count George Apponyi and Ladislas Szögyény appeared on behalf of Hungary in order to unite with the Czechs and to help to victory the *Federalists* against the *Centralists*, which proved a complete success and resulted in a 43 to 16 majority for the *Federalists*.

Count Rechberg in despair left the Czechs to their fate, and going over to the Magyars on 20th October, the *October Diploma* was granted by the Emperor. It proved another failure, however as in giving a *Landtag* to every *Kronland*, it re-created an United Austria incorporating the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen.¹

96. Louis Kossuth remained faithful to the complete separation embodied in the dethronement of 1849 and worked for the revision of the settlement by war.

On the night of the 5th May 1859 the Governor

¹ All documents have been published in the SOM 1868. Pp. 2—16.

of Hungary arrived in Paris and on the same night was received in audience by Emperor Napoleon III, who accepted scheme of co-operation with the Hungarian emigrants for a diversion or for a military co-operation to be made on Hungarian territory. „Ce que vous venez de me dire” — he said to the Governor — „est très intéressant et bien important. Aussi je vous prie, de donner suite à ce projet, et soyez persuadé qu'une fois la neutralité de l'Angleterre assurée, vous aurez écarté le principal obstacle à la réalisation de vos vœux patriotiques”.¹ The emperor requested him to return to London and endeavour to bring about the fall of the Conservative Government of Lord Derby, which was unfavourable to the design of France in Italy, and Kossuth left for England. After his speeches on the 20th May at London Tavern, on the 24th in Manchester, on the 25th in Bradford, and on the 26th in Glasgow, he was able to turn public opinion against Austria and on the 11th June the Derby Government resigned. On the 16th Kossuth left with a Sardinian passport for Genoa, where a Hungarian National Directorium — founded on the 6th May in Paris by Louis Kossuth, Count Ladislas Teleki and General George Klapka — set to work. By the permission of the Sardinian Government (dated 24th May) a Hungarian Legion was formed for the previously planned diversion and on 3rd July Kossuth again called upon the French Emperor in the hope of coming to an understanding. The King of Sardinia sat in the antechamber. Kossuth related

¹ Chiala op. cit. Page 41. For particulars cf. the memoirs of Kossuth Vols. I-III.

the success of his tour in England and referred to the great services done by him for France. „As the only barrier is now demolished, what is Your Majesty's plan for Hungary?" he asked, but received no answer.¹ On the 5th he was asked by Cavour to start a revolution in Hungary and he assured the Governor in the name of the Sardinian Government that „that will compromise us and I desire that we should be compromised, for then there will be no half-peace".² On the following day however Napoleon sent General Fleury to Verona, and by the armistice of Villafranca both Hungary and Sardinia were left in the lurch.

Kossuth's foreign policy came again to a disastrous end and the Governor now turned to Servia and Roumania in order to arrange for the invasion of Hungary from the South, and to start the revolution without foreign help.³ He sent agents, guns and ample ammunition to Belgrade and Bukarest; but the action of the Sardinian agents on the Lower Danube was not favoured by France.⁴ At the end of 1860 the transport at Galatz was seized by Austrian

¹ Kossuth op. cit. Vol. I. Page 443.

² Chiala op. cit. Pp. 61. and seq.

³ The agreement of May 1859, between Alexander Cuza, Prince of Roumania and General George Klapka was published by *Urechia* op. cit. Pp. 4-5, and by B. Jancsó. *Our War of Independence and the Dacoroman Tendencies.* (Hung.) Budapest 1896. Pp. 248-52. That of July 1859 made at Turin between Kossuth and the agent of Roumania, John Balaceanu is published by Kossuth op. cit. Vol. III. Pp. 69—70. For particulars *ibid.*

⁴ Thouvenel. *Le secret de l'Empereur.* Vol. I. Paris 1889. Page 329.

authorities Count Teleki was arrested by the Austrian police in Dresden and taken on to Austria. He was advised by Count Cavour that Italy could not undertake an offensive War; and after these failures Kossuth retired into private life at Turin.

XX. The Compromise.

1861—1871.

97. Abandoned by all the Powers, Austria was to be held up — if possible — by her own people and by that new method the people of Austria could not remain in the autocratic and artificial union of Prince Schwartzenberg.

By the revival of historic rights and reminiscences, the dream of ages seemed about to be realised.

As for Hungary, on the 26th December 1860 Francis Deák, the *Philosopher of the Fatherland*, whom Prince Windischgrätz had discredited, was called to Vienna and convinced the uncrowned king Francis Joseph, that Hungarian public opinion stood on the ground of the Laws of 1848. It could be no longer denied that the Nationalities also joined the Magyars and that historic Hungary once more united against foreign oppression. „His Majesty spoke of the Parliament” — wrote Francis Deák to a relative — „and he said, that he would convoke it as early as possible, and asked me, whether I thought the elections would be favourable. His Majesty spoke also of the reunion of the Vojvodina and said that the Serbs ought not to be repudiated by the Magyars. He remarked that, being likewise the emperor of the other provinces also he could

not be blind to their interests and that he would welcome a just compromise in the affairs common to the Empire, and he said he failed to see why the Magyars do not accept, for the common affairs, an Imperial Council or an Imperial Parliament. For a basis we want the Laws of 1848 in their whole extent."¹ And on the 9th February at the County Assembly of Zemplén, Count Julius Andrassy, the former envoy at Stambul, who was hanged in effigie but afterwards amnestied spoke to the same effect.

98 The Patent of 26th February provided for every *Kronland* a *Landtag*, and for the whole Empire together with the lands of the Crown of St Stephen an Imperial Parliament. Hungary received the right to send 85, Transylvania 26, Croatia-Slavonia 9, Venice 20 and the other dominions of the Austrian Empire 203 representatives.

The Czechs hoped that Hungary would accept this arrangement and when their *Landtag* was opened on 6th April, on the advice of Francis Ladislav Rieger, the son-in-law of Frantisek Palacky, they determined to appear in full force in the *Reichsrath*.

But the Hungarian Parliament was¹ opened on 2nd April with a curious obstacle only the Conservatives together with the liberal Francis Deák appearing at the Royal Palace to hear the Speech from the Throne, and when the Parliament was opened, it repudiated the February Patent with unanimity. It was merely the form of the address which made the difference between the friends of Deák and

¹ 9 January 1861. Pest. Deák to Joseph Tarányi. DB Vol. II. Page 305.

those of the intransigent Kálmán Tisza, the former proposing a memorandum, the other a simple resolution. On 5th June Deák's proposition was carried by only 155 votes to 152, and thus was born the famous Memorandum of Deák, an unrivalled state paper in the annals of history: the majestic defence of the Laws of 1748.¹

All was in vain however, for on the 21th July it was rejected by the Austrian Minister Schmerling.

On the 8th August a second Memorandum of Deák was accepted by the Parliament vetoing the policy of the Court, and on the 22nd the Parliament was dissolved.

99. The period of the Provisorium (1861—65), as it was called, resulted in the complete victory of Deák, who was joined even by the Conservatives, while the nationalists represented in the *Reichsrath* retired gradually from Vienna.

The Austrian Government led by Count Rechberg hastened back to the Nationalities and Rechberg even told them that „an independent Hungary could not stand against her nationalities”,² but he forgot to add „against the nationalities turned by every means against the Magyars by the Austrian Government.”

In 1865 he had published a book on Hungarian Politics, but Wenzel Lustkandl's one sided compilation (*Das ungarisch-österreichische Staatsrecht*, 1865) was cut to pieces by Francis Deák in the *Pesti Napló*, published on Easter Sunday, 16th April 1865. „The Easter Article” proved a turning point,

¹ Published in D. B. Vol. III.

² Sz. E. Vol. III. Page 313.

since it was not based on the Laws of 1848 only : seeing impossible a compromise with Austria without the solution of the questions relating to Common Affairs, it declared „We are at all times ready to bring our laws in a legal way into harmony with the security of His Majesty's Empire“.

100. Francis Joseph at once accepted the helping hand of Deák, and on the 6th June he appeared at Budapest, where he promised a new Parliament. On the 27th July the Reichsrath was dissolved and Schmerling was replaced by Count Richard Belcredi; on the 18th September the Parliament was summoned to meet at Budapest and on the 20th the Patent of 26th February 1861 was revoked.

The king opened Parliament in person on 10th December, and as the diet of Transylvania, opened on 26th November again voted for the reunion on 15th December, the representatives of Transylvania were invited to the Budapest Parliament.

The Transylvanian members joining Francis Deák, the *Philosopher of the Fatherland* commanded an unrivalled majority, by which work of the Compromise was begun.

The Austro-Prussian War of 1866 again brought matters to a crisis. A Hungarian legion equipped by Prussia under General Klapka, the hero of Komárom, set foot on the Northwestern frontier of Hungary, but when on the 29th July Deák was once more called to Francis Joseph, he assured the Emperor that „he and his nation desired no more now than they did before the War“.

This declaration made a never to-be-forgotten impression on the King and, on 7th February 1867 the last man of the old Austria, Count Belcredi was

replaced by a foreigner uninterested in the Austro-Hungarian controversy.

On the following day Deák was called to an audience and on 19 Count Julius Andrassy was appointed the second constitutional Premier of the Kingdom of Hungary.

Deák reported a full victory over the Austrian Centralists, but in a letter dated 22rd February Louis Kossuth protested against a Compromise.

Deák remained quiet, and between the rocks and shoals of 1847 and 1849 safely steered his ship to the 8th June 1867, when the coronation of Francis Joseph gave the land a constitutional king.

101. The Compromise of 1867 is not so designated on account of its being made between Hungary and Austria in that year. It was so named only after the solemn coronation of Francis Joseph as king of Hungary and, after the promulgation of a decree to the effect that *„on the 2rd December 1848 King Ferdinand V abdicated without the assent of the Parliament of Hungary; that this abdication cannot therefore form a precedent for the future“* — thus investing Francis Joseph with the plenitude of royal power in accordance with the Constitution.

The Compromise of 1867 is rather the whole complex of all acts relating to the change of the legal position between Hungary and Austria, from the *Easter Article* of Francis Deák to the retirement of Count Andrassy from the Premiership, from 1865 to 1871.

In these six years every important question was settled on a legal basis.

As to the executive power: The legal position of a King of Hungary was clearly separated from that

of an Austrian Emperor, while at the same time a separate Constitution was granted to the Austrian Empire, and thus there arose two Governments quite independent from and in no relation whatever with each other.

As to the legislative power: Two independent Parliaments were created; one specially set up for the Austrian Empire, and one restored in the Kingdom of Hungary.

For the Administration of the Common Affairs so-called Common Ministries were specially founded such as the ministries of Foreign Affairs, War and of Finances. The national Governments had no special Foreign Ministers, though there were two War Ministers for presiding over the *Landwehr* of Austria and the *Honvédség* of Hungary, respectively the standing army being recruited from the remnant of the recruits enrolled for the Common Army; and there was also a Common Minister of Finances for the administration of the funds voted for the supply of the Court, the Foreign Affairs and the Army.

There being no united *Reichsrath*, a delegation was every year sent out by each Parliament to meet alternatively in Vienna and Budapest, in order to hear and criticise in the name of their Parliaments the reports of the Common Ministers, who were responsible to these Delegations (*Commissions internationales*).¹ But the Delegations were not to be united in a common *Reichsrath* and they remained nothing else than Committees of the national Parliaments.

¹ Eisenman op. cit. Pp. 602 et seq.

The Compromise was supplemented by a special Agreement between Hungary and Croatia and by a Law regarding the Nationalities.

As for the former the Act of 1868. XXX. § marks a new era in the Croato-Hungarian relations.

102. It would be a great mistake to suppose that Hungary now took in to own hands the direction of her Foreign Affairs, because this had never been out of the hands of the Austrian Foreign Office at the *Ballhausplatz* of Vienna. From 1815 onwards many Hungarians received high places in the foreign service, but they were thereby almost lost for Hungary and became attached to Vienna circles. So strong were the traditions of the Vienna bureau, of the Dynasty and of the Austrian Empire, that no one, whether German or Czech, Pole or Italian, Magyar or Croat was ever able to emancipate himself from the old rules of their foreign policy. All became assimilated into a peculiar body without national character, aim or destiny.

One thing alone was strong enough to defy the old rules of the Austrian System: this was the geographical position, and the historical, economical and political development of the lands of St. Stephen, the firm basis of the Dual Monarchy.

The first Hungarian Premier of the Dual System, Count Julius Andrássy, waged war to the knife with the ghosts of Vienna, who never recognised a nation and for whom the „*Völker*“ of the Imperial Manifestoes were only as „*herds*“ swept together by the Providence supply faithful servants to the exalted Rulers who resided in the sublime atmosphere of the Vienna Court. On these ghosts a Hungarian nobleman, once hanged in effigy by order of the Emperor

had dared to declare war, and the role of a Hungarian Premier not being prescribed for in the ceremonial of the Court, the „foreigner“ took his seat amidst general consternation in the arm-chair of Prince Metternich at the Ballhausplatz.

It was Count Andrassy who as a man of 1848 had helped to bring into existence both the German and the Italian Unities, because the German and Italian hegemony of the Habsburgs was ever a menace to both the constitutional development and independence of the Kingdom of Hungary. In this question he was ever in opposition to the Common Foreign Minister, Count Beust, who styled himself Chancellor of Austria-Hungary, and who everywhere exploited the possibility of a *revanche* for Sadowa, where his fatherland, Saxony fell, and so he ever worked for an anti-Prussian alliance between Austria-Hungary, France and Russia. It is very interesting to examine this opposition, since, it originated in the geographical position and political development of both Hungary and Austria. To link together Germany, Austria, Hungary and Italy, as they (except Hungary) were linked together by the Hohenstaufens, Habsburgs and Hohenzollerns (Triple Alliance) this union of the Continental states of Central Europe always returned in the history of Europe; while attack on this central formation from West and East was a constant danger which prevented both Frederick the Great and Prince Bismarck from sleeping and brought the Hohenstaufens, the Habsburgs and the Hohenzollerns finally to ruin.

To Count Beust however Central Europe ever remained a *terra incognita*, while for Count Andrassy it was a barrier against the renewal of Russian aggres-

sion so fateful in 1849. It was on account of this that he opposed the Franco-Bavarian-Austrian alliance of the Habsburgs, as he opposed the Prusso-Russo-Roumanian alliance of the Hohenzollerns and of the Romanoffs, both combinations being directed against the constitutional liberty and the political freedom of Hungary, if not against the safety of the lands of St. Stephen.

For Andr ssy the only way out was friendship with the West and defence against the aggression of the East. He never supported the Imperialism of the Prussian Conservatives against France, though he disarmed Count Beust, who in his hatred of Prussia tried to dissolve Central Europe, the only guarantee of the peace of Europe against the great designs of the Tsars of Holy Russia. The alliance of France, Austria and Russia meant to him the renewal of the old policy of Prince Kaunitz, the subversion of the system and the destruction of the great results of 1848, which were everywhere accepted and realised in the Sixties; a European conflagration in which the forces of Napoleon III had perhaps met those of Alexander II on the great plain of the Tisza. The *revanche* of Count Beust meant an European War and this War was to be averted at all costs.

For that reason he opposed the Austro-Russian alliance of 1870 and Count Beust was dismissed. For that, also after the defeat of Emperor Napoleon he turned to the East in order to win over the Hohenzollerns of Roumania and to build up a common barrier together with the Principality against another Russian aggression. The alliance was ever approved by the leading statesmen of Hungary,

including Baron Wesselényi and Louis Kossuth. It was Kossuth who first called attention to Roumania by describing it as „a peninsula surrounded on its three sides by a Sea of Slavs. On this Sea the waves of the Russian Power run down to its coasts. If there are two neighbours in the World called to be united against a common danger, they are Hungary and Roumania“.¹ After the frustration of the attempts at an alliance between the two nations in 1849 and 1859 Count Andrassy, the diplomat sent in 1849 to the Balkan Peninsula, held the same views. In 1868 he asked the Chancellery if it was Bismarck who turned the Prusso-Russian interest against Hungary by endorsing the Transylvanian designs of the Bucharest politicians, as in that case he must seek, as he was certainly to find, able guarantees at Paris. Bismarck answered with an ultimatum sent by him to Bucharest and he was determined to recall the Prussian Minister if the politicians of Prince Charles ceased not to attack Transylvania.²

At the same time however Andrassy offered his hand to Roumania and counselled the Prince in these words: „You should accept the hand held out to You freely and loyally by the Hungarian Government in order to build up a firm barrier against the deluge of the Slavs“.³ Prince Charles accepted,

¹ *Kossuth: Works (Hung.) Vol. VII. Budapest 1900. Page 378.*

² *Wertheimer op. cit. Vol. I. Pp. 551—52.*

³ *Memoirs of King Charles of Roumania. passim (Stuttgart 1892).*

but John Bratianu rejected it, and the two nations consequently came to no understanding with each other.

By the alliance of Germany and Italy, Austro-Hungary, Servia and Roumania, the System of 1848 was saved and it was made the base and the guarantee of the Compromise of 1867.

CHAPTER IV.

Decline and Fall of the Dual Monarchy. 1871—1920.

XXI. Strength and Weakness of the Dual System. 1871—1895.

103. The Dual System was founded upon Austria on the one part and upon Hungary on the other, and in this error lay the fate of the Dual System.

If we look into the question we see that in Deák's opinion Austria meant the hereditary provinces of the Habsburgs as a historical and political unit. In his mind Austria was a state as perfect as England or France, a state really perfect in the sense of law, but lacking the great forces of sound historical development.

The Habsburgs acquired the Austrian provinces as an imperial fief and an integral part of the German Empire, and they possessed them as Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire. By their family connections they added Hungary to their family possessions, but not to the German Empire; and therein lay the first and greatest difference between the hereditary provinces dependent on a foreign state and an independent Kingdom. When in 1866 the Habsburgs lost Germany, and instead of depending on the German Empire, they were

forced to develop their Austrian provinces into a separate state, this proved a complete failure, because Austria's territory was a crescent stretching from Czernovitz in the East to Cattaro in the South, while the Austrian nation was composed of many races inclining towards other similar races which formed separate states around the frontiers.

The Dynasty and the Court remained thoroughly German, and the Austrian Empire was built upon the Germans, this fact being accepted by both Deák and Count Andrassy, in whose mentality Austria ever remained a purely German formation.

In their mind the historical rule of the German minority of Austria amounted (and therein lay their error) to the historical rule of the Magyar majority in their own country, and they had no wish to meddle in the internal affairs of the neighbouring state in order to eliminate the Austrian interference in the affairs of the Crown of St. Stephen.

104. But they were not justified by the historical evolution, and reality was already en route, when in October 1870 Professor Albert Schäffle became Premier of the Austrian Empire and opened the doors to the Slav majority. On 10th August 1871 the Austrian *Reichsrath* was dissolved and on 12th September the Emperor promised to the Czechs his Royal Coronation at Prague. The promise accompanied by numerous Slavophil measures of the Government (Professor Schäffle and Count Hohenwart) aroused great anxiety at Budapest. Not because the Slavophil tendencies of the Government of another state formed an obstacle to Deák or Count Andrassy, but because the Compromise of 1867 has

been made between two states one of which was in course of dissolution.

On 20th October the federalist members of the Cabinet suffered a complete defeat, Count Hohenwart being replaced by Prince Adolphus Auersperg and Count Beust by Count Andrassy.

105. Count Andrassy's nomination was a result of his political attitude.

He strongly objected to the preponderance of the Slavs because on the one hand he held it a dangerous opposition to a German minority by its tendency to the Pan Slavism, also because he held it dangerous to the Compromise made with the one state only; and on the other hand because Austria transformed into a Slav state would be dominated if not absorbed by the immense Slav Empire of Eastern Europe.

Count Andrassy, the man of 1849 did not forget the ambitions of Tsar Nicholas I. and fearing another Russian invasion, he saw salvation only in accepting the portfolio of Foreign Affairs.

But by his determination he recognised another weakness of the Dualism, since he placed his second portfolio on a higher level than his first one. The Minister of Foreign Affairs was in reality not a Common Minister and if the theory was denied, the practice was accepted by him, when he now became the Minister of the one Household representing the one Ruler of the one Austro-Hungarian Empire and representing his Lord in the common councils of both Cabinets, where the Premiers of Hungary and Austria sat only by the side of the representative of the King-Emperor.

By the promotion of Count Andrassy the Slav

danger was averted and the Compromise of 1867 remained in its original form, though Austria remained under the exclusive control of a German minority and it was proved that the two states were governed by a Chancellor higher in rank than the Premiers of the simple states blended together in a higher unity.

106. From 14th November 1871 Hungary had no strong Governments and the Premiers that followed each other were unable to adapt the Compromise to the needs of modern times.

The reaction came from Croatia, where through the absolute weakness of Banus Koloman Bedekovich the Unionist Party suffered a complete defeat in the elections of 1872. The Unionist members of the *sabor* were opposed by 53 Nationalists led by Ante Starchevich, and the separatist movement was suppressed only with great difficulty by the Government.

Francis Deák being now dead, on 23rd January 1875 Count Andrassy called upon Koloman Tisza, the popular leader of the opposition with the request to save the Compromise with Austria. Thus by the fusion of the Left with Deák's Party came into existence the Liberal Party which in the general election of July gained 330 seats in the Parliament, while the Independents, the friends of Kossuth, only received 37, the Nationalities 25 and the Conservatives 19.

107. A popular man and the mandatary of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and of the Household combined in one person, the strong man of 1875 became at once the strong man of the nation and the ardent advocate of the Court.

In Parliament he had no opposition, and being unaccustomed to tolerate contrary opinions, with an almost unrivalled power in his hand he was ready to meet the opposing forces from whatever side they might appear.

Svetosar Miletich was the first who met him on the battlefield, when in 1876 he organised a Serb rising in order to join the Principality. He was imprisoned and left his prison as a broken old man in 1881, when Serbia became an ally of Austria.

The Croats followed, and Strachevich still having a majority, Tisza turned to the Serbs of Croatia-Slavonia. The majority created by the new Banus Charles Khunn-Héderváry (1883—1903) was therefore no longer a Croat, but a Croato-Serb majority, while Strachevich had only 25 Croats to oppose the 69 Unionist members of the Government.

The Roumanians appeared on the scene with an irredentist newspaper, the *Tribuna* founded in 1884, but its editor, Juon Slavici was soon compelled to take refuge in Roumania.

If Tisza was justified in his strong measures against irredentism, his policy towards Austria was hardly endorsed by the majority surprised by the unexpected weakness of the „General“.

The Common Cabinet Council of 2nd May 1876 held under the presidency of the King-Emperor agreed in the founding of a common State Bank, by which the nature of the relation between Hungary and Austria were obviously changed. When Tisza, once the ardent opponent of the moderate Deák in the Parliaments of 1861 and 1865, tendered the bill before his Party on the night of the 9th, it was only accepted by 181 to 69 and these 69 Members of the

Majority were forced at once to leave the Government benches.

He had further great difficulties with the Army question, as the high military circles of Vienna wanted the recruits voted for 10 year instead of 1 year, and the bill was only accepted by leaving out the fatal question of the recruits.

This amounted to a defeat and on 15th March 1890 the „General“ left his place to his moderate friends, who were unable to meet the sudden growth of the opposition, the last Premier of the period, Alexander Wekerle, alone being able to split his opponents into a Catholic and a Protestant Party by his Civil Marriage Act of 1894.

On 20th March of that year, Louis Kossuth died at Turin; and when his body crossed the frontier, the train of the King-Emperor was followed for half a day by the train carrying his dead enemy.

108. By the treaties of 1866 Austria lost her influence in both Germany and Italy, and the crescent stretching from Czernovitz to Cattaro was unable to stand without the support of Hungary. By the Compromise of 1867 under the name of „Austria-Hungary“ she became again a great power in Europe, the only price paid for this being the restoration of the old Constitution in Hungary and the granting of Parliamentary Government to Austria.

But Austria herself was a mere union of the most heterogenous provinces only held together by the person of the Emperor, whose manifestoes were always addressed „To My Peoples“ (*An meine Völker*) and never to an Austrian Nation. This address he was unfortunate enough to apply to Hungary also which was an historical and national unit par

excellence in spite of her many nationalities, and so by the Compromise of 1867 Hungary came under the evil influence of the federal tendencies of the many nations welded together under the name of Austria. To oppose this influence, the statesmen of Hungary secured the hegemony to the German population, army and Court of Austria and formed a powerful opposition to the Pan Slavist tendencies of the Russian Court.

But the German hegemony had its undoubted evils. It was ever and naturally opposed by the majority of the Austrian Empire; by the Czechs of Bohemia and by the Poles of Galicia; by the Ruthenians and Roumanians of Eastern Galicia and Bukovina; by the Slovenes of Kraina and Carinthia; by the Croats and Serbs of Dalmatia, by the Italians of Trentino, Triest and Istria. Moreover it was opposed in Hungary, as both the German Court and the German Army had become insurmountable barriers in the way of the nation.

109. To Count Andrassy was due the great merit of fixing the destiny of the new Great Power founded on the Middle Danube.

He found the best guarantee of Hungary's constitutional right in alliance with the German Empire, and by his reliance on Germany he turned attention to the Near East in order to create a separate sphere of influence for the Dual Monarchy.

The friendly visit of Tsar Alexander II to Vienna in 1873 and of the King-Emperor Francis Joseph to St. Petersburg in 1874 promised the brightest hopes for a *Dreikaiserbündnis* of the three Powers united by the partition of Poland; but the harmony was destroyed by Count Nicholas Pavlovitch Ignatiev,

who led the Russian Army down to the outskirts of Constantinople. The danger lay not in the military success of Tsar Alexander II; the greater danger lay in his dissolving the new Holy Alliance, and especially in the sudden antagonism between Austria and Russia occasioned by the alliance of all the Balkan States with the great Slav Power of the North.

The treaty made on 3rd March at San Stefano, a suburb of Constantinople, therefore amounted to a declaration of war and challenged the counteraction of Count Andrassy.

110. The friends of Count Radetzky, the idol of the military circles of Vienna proposed an advance on the Eastern shores of the Adriatic into the hinterland of Dalmatia and the programme was accepted by Count Andrassy, when in the Budapest Agreement of 15th January 1867 he offered neutrality to Russia on the basis Austria's being allowed to annex the Turkish Provinces of Bosnia and Hercegovina.

On the 3rd February, one month before the Treaty of San Stefano was concluded, he proposed an European Conference, and so came to pass the so called Congress of Berlin, by which the Russian Treaty was transformed into a Berlin Treaty, while Russia handed over the Balkan Peninsula and her Balkan allies to Austro-Hungarian hegemony.

In the 1878 the provinces of Bosnia and Hercegovina were occupied, and on 28th June 1881 Serbia, and on 30th October 1883 Roumania, entered into alliance with the Dual Monarchy.

111. The Treaty of Berlin proved a turning point in European history.

It was first of all made in Berlin and under the

presidency of Prince Bismarck, who by endorsing Count Andrassy's policy averted for ever the attention of the Habsburgs from Germany and gave them a new field for expansion towards Salonika.

This was only possible by avoiding the Russian danger, but as Russia was deprived of the fruits of her victory and might seek revenge against the neighbouring Powers, Germany and the Dual Monarchy concluded a secret alliance against a potential Russian *revanche*.

The *Zweibund* of 7th October 1879 was therefore a result of the Berlin Treaty. Shortly afterwards the new Prince of Bulgaria, Ferdinand of Coburg also joined, and thus Count Andrassy founded an Austro-Hungarian hegemony on the Balkan Peninsula supported by the powerful German Empire.

112. This hegemony however aroused unsurmountable difficulties in the Dual System.

First of all it was not a common but an united army, commanded by a purely German military staff, which by its easy victory on the heights of Sarajevo became an unrivalled power and a separate state in the somewhat confused system of the two states united in the Dual System. From that time hereforth the theory of a third and a superstate shadowed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and of the Household united with the unlimited influence of the military circles resembling the ancient *Hofkriegsrat*.

This theoretical superstate obtained a solid basis in the newly occupied provinces, in that they were not incorporated into Austria or Hungary, but came under the control of the Minister of the Common Finances simply because he had not a financial administration, and by only accepting the sums gran-

ted by the two Parliaments for the Common Army and the Foreign Affairs, he seemed inferior to his powerful colleagues. He now became the Viceroy of the new Provinces claimed at once by Hungary and Austria, but awarded to neither. As they remained a *Reichsland*, the theory of the superstate turned out a reality.

It was the mistake of Koloman Tisza that by the Law VI. § 1886 he adjourned this important question *ad Graecas Kalendas* and made a *provisorium* by which the final settlement of Bosnia-Hercegovina could be made by the united assent of both Parliaments alone.

The only consolation for this was that Count Andrassy filled the most important places with Magyars. Magyars were sent to London and Paris, to Berlin and Sarajevo as Ambassadors and Viceroys, but it would be mistake to imagine that they initiated a thoroughly Magyar policy along every line. Only the men were changed; they continued to represent an Austrian Empire and were lost for society at home.

By the failure to settle the relations between Hungary and Austria the scales were turned in favour of the latter.

XXII. *Crisis of the Dual System.*

1895—1910.

113. Baron Desider Bánffy, the first Transylvanian at the head of the Royal Government, commanded a powerful majority and was opposed by merely small groups of the opposition. But by his strong hand he widened the gulf between the nation and

the nationalities and united all opposition groups against the Government. The storm was only postponed by the Millenium Celebrations of 1896, the last quiet year in the last quarter of the century. Count Albert Apponyi on behalf of the opposition having proposed and the Premier accepted a *Treuga Dei*. The King and Queen Elizabeth (the latter the most beloved of nearly all the Queens of Hungary) spent the great part of that year in the country.

In the autumn the storm burst, when Baron Bánffy fixed the quota of the budget of the Common Affairs as 34.4% instead of 31.4% according to the Ischl Agreement made with Count Leo Thun, the Austrian Premier, but accepted by neither Hungary nor Austria. Instead of the two Governments the two Parliaments representing the two states confronted each other in a bitter controversy over the relation to each other and to the superstate of the Court, of the Army, of the Foreign Affairs and of the *Reichsland*.

Count Thun settled the question by a simple act well known in Austria, which had ever Paper Constitutions, and the Imperial decree of 21st September 1899, based on the famous Art. XIV. § 1867 of the Constitutional Charter, sanctioned the Ischl Agreement for Austria. But Hungary had a historical Constitution and Baron Bánffy saw with great embarrassment that the prominent members of his party had gone over to the opposition and the Laws I-IV of 1899 gave only a four months Indemnity and voted the recruits only for one year. On 26th February he was replaced by Koloman Széll, a relative and pupil of Francis Deák, who in Law XXX of 1899 acknowledged the legality of a separate

Hungarian Custom, this being the first retrograde step through the Compromise of 1867 to the Laws of 1848 and towards the substitution of the increasing *Real Union* by a *Personal Union* founded on the *Pragmatic Sanction*, the basis of all Compromises with Austria.

114. Koloman Széll united all the moderates in a powerful majority and his premiership resembled the golden age of Francis Deák. He was supported by Count Stephen Tisza (the son of the „General”), by Desider Szilágyi, the greatest debater and the cleverest head of his time, feared at the same time by all the extremists, both Right and Left sides and fully respected even by the King, by Count Julius Andrássy the younger, the defender of the heritage of his father, by Count Albert Apponyi, the ideal of both Parliament and public opinion, while the opposition led by Francis Kossuth, the son of the late Governor, was condemned to silence.

At this point came a sudden intervention on the part of Austria.

115. Hungarian public opinion was not aware that the situation of the whole of Europe had changed.

That powerful alliance which united the German Empire and the Dual Monarchy in the *Zweibund* of 1879, Italy in the *Triple Alliance* of 1882, which secured the full sympathy of Spain, and since 1887 that of England too, and was joined by all the Balkan States without exception, came to an end.

The German *Weltpolitik* dropped the Russian alliance, and by alienating the British Empire it counted only on the Dual Monarchy. But German politicians never understood the real bases of the

Dual System, and by their exclusive dependence on Vienna they alienated Budapest. They were convinced that as the *Weltpolitik* was made by the highest circles of Berlin, the Dual Monarchy could be secured through the highest circles of Vienna. But the Vienna circles represented a purely German Court and a purely German military staff and when in 1903 more recruits were demanded, Hungary was confronted with a German hegemony supported by a powerful German Empire.

It was in vain that Count Stephen Tisza recognised the danger of standing or falling together with Germany and Austria against Holy Russia depending on France in the West and on the Balkan States in the East; the harmony restored in 1899 was destroyed in 1903.

On 16th June 1903 Koloman Széll resigned, but neither Count Tisza, nor his brother-in-law, Count Charles Khuen-Héderváry succeeded in forming a Cabinet.

On 16th September a military order of the day was published at Chlopy, in Moravia, in which the Supreme War Lord announced his intention to preserve his Army a perfect unit uninfluenced by the special interests of his peoples, (*Völkerstämme*.)

On 23rd September Koerber, the Austrian Minister, resigned on account of all the schemes for army reform, and on 28th October Count Stephen Tisza formed a Cabinet on the platform of military reform, worked out by a Committee of Nine under the presidency of Koloman Széll. He left the settlement of the language question to the King, but on that point he was confronted with a general attack on the part of the Opposition. He was now ready to break down

every obstruction, but his strong measures resulted in the secession of count Apponyi, who in 1903 had joined the Independents of Francis Kossuth, and of Count Andrássy, who in November 1904 founded the Constitutional Party. On 3rd January 1905 Parliament was dissolved and in the winter election the Government won 151 seats against 242, the Independents alone gaining 159 seats in the Parliament.

On 2nd February Tisza resigned a second time and he left the way open for the new majority.

But on that point he was confronted with the military circles of Vienna, against whom both he and the majority proved equally impotent.

On 18th June General Baron Géza Fejérváry was commanded to form a business Cabinet, and on 19th February 1906 the Parliament was dissolved by military force.

116. A study of the grave crisis of 1905 leads us to the conviction that the political events above referred to originated at Vienna and we cannot doubt that time will prove the correctness of this view.

It was the period when the superstate at Vienna saw the opportunity to upset the Compromise of 1867 and to replace it by a central power represented by the King-Emperor.

We must not omit to state, that the highest military command remained outside the limits of the Compromise and that the military staff (the Imperial *Generalstab*) never accepted it. The staff worked in the name of the Supreme War-Lord and worked in accordance with a map, on which there were no frontiers between Austria or Hungary, Hungary or Croatia, Croatia or Bosnia-Hercegovina. The order

of the day published at Chlopy was given out without respect to the three ministers of war, all three going their separate ways in the labyrinth of the Dual System.

It was the duty of this staff to guard the vital question and take care that Austria-Hungary did not develop into states united by the mere person of a common ruler, but to strengthen the ties of a Real Union and weld together the Dual Monarchy into the ideal unit of Prince Schwartzenberg.

This programme united all the enemies of the Realm of St Stephen and as early as 1905 we see them well ranged on every front.

Its bulk lay in the military staff, where the military power of the Dual Monarchy lay.

Its propaganda was made by the Austrian lawyers, who from that time waged an open war against the historical constitution of Hungary and in a short time arose a rich literature denouncing in the German language the pretention to separate rights of the Crown of St Stephen which resulted in the alienation of public opinion, even in Germany, from the Magyars, the firm basis of the Triple Alliance.

The military government worked for the destruction of autonomy, and when General Fejérváry was commanded to take the Government of Hungary in hand, Royal Commissioners were sent to the Counties.

Everywhere they met opposition and signs of a Civil War were seen, to the great embarrassment of Vienna and to the greater of Berlin, where the whole system of *Weltpolitik* was built upon the alliance with Austria-Hungary.

It was therefore a wise measure to go no further. On 5th April 1906 General Fejérváry called upon

Francis Kossuth, and on the 7th a pactum was made, on the ground of which Alexandre Wekerle formed a constitutional Cabinet on the 8th April that year.

The liberal party created in 1875 was dissolved and Count Tisza retired; the elections of May gave a majority to the Independent Party led by Kossuth, who himself was received by the King.

117. This defeat led from bad to worse, causing the superstate to become active and directed to the way where the constitutional Government had no influence, that of Foreign Policy.

The Foreign Policy of Austria-Hungary was directed by the Common Minister of Foreign Affairs and of the Household, who from 1895 was the Polish Count Agenor Goluchowsky. He was a colleague of Count Bülow when they represented the *Zweibund* at Bucharest, and on the *Ballhausplatz* he left his own business to the Chancellor of the German Empire. This undoubted fact was not discovered until the Algeciras Conference, after which the „brilliant second“ was dismissed.

During the period of twelve years (1895—1906) everything changed: Count Goluchowsky however remained quiet.

Since 1895 Bulgaria had gradually turned to Russia, which again turned her attention to Europe. It was to the interest of Germany to come at an understanding in order to avoid the *Zweifrontkrieg* forced upon her by the Franco-Russian alliance, and in 1897 the Balkan Peninsula was divided into an oriental sphere, where Russian influence prevailed, and into a western zone where Austria looked out from the Sandjak Novibazar towards Salonika. But

Italy was reckoned for Count Bülow as much as Russia; therefore in 1899 Albania was placed under an Austro-Italian and in 1903 Macedonia under an Austro-Russian condominium. In other words, Count Bülow let Italy and Russia into the Balkan Peninsula at the cost of his Austrian ally in order to save the Triple Alliance and to detach Russia from France.

Its consequences were soon apparent.

In the bloody revolution of 1903 the Austrophil Alexander Obrenovitch was replaced by Peter Karageorgievitch and Serbia joined her Slav protector, Russia standing behind the pact made with Bulgaria in the last days of 1905, when the Zollverein of the two countries was made.

But in Algeciras Russia together with Italy voted against the *Zweibund* and Count Goluchowsky was dismissed.

118. From that day a new period began in Austrian Politics, that of the initiative of the superstate of the Austrian Imperialism.

It was Crown Prince Francis Ferdinand who, in his anxiety for his future, took over the leadership.

His attitude was never favourable to Hungary and he seems to have been imbued with the idea of creating a great and united Austria, the ideal of both the civil and military Centralists. For him the Hungarian question was merely the clamour of a turbulent party, which sought to jeopardise his pet schemes by a complete separation from Austria.

In his vast Empire he was prepared to grant equal rights to his every *Volk und Völkerschaft*, and he was informed that the general franchise would be the only way of salvation. He was perhaps

told also, that this would lead to the majority of the Slavs, but he always resided in his wife's, the Countess Chotek's fatherland and the Czechs were flattered with the prospect of taking over the Government of the Dual Monarchy after the death of old Francis Joseph.

To the realisation of this design Hungary formed a barrier and it was detestable to make a pact and to accept a Government against the intention of the Centralists. It was therefore prescribed for Wekerle to introduce the general franchise into Hungary also and so weld all the Habsburg lands together into an united Empire based on the general franchise and the Slav majority.

119. At the last moment the machine broke down and turned with a sudden rapidity against Holy Russia.

On 26th October Count Goluchowsky was replaced by Baron Aehrenthal, and on 18th November General Conrad was put in command of the military staff.

The former was selected to open the new direction, the latter to give it a firm basis in the army.

In Conrad's opinion Hungary was „eine Gefahr für das Gesamtreich“¹ and this danger was only to be averted partly by „eine gemeinsame Zentralgewalt bei möglichster Autonomie der Teile“,² by „Abbruch jedweder Verhandlungen, Lösung des bisherigen Ausgleiches, wenn nötig, Sistirung der Verfassung“³ and by a vigorous action on the place

¹ CMD Vol. I. Wien 1921. Page 50

² Ibid. Page 54.

³ Ibid. Page 52.

where by Count Goluchowsky's weakness the Dual Monarchy was beaten: the Balkan Peninsula.¹

The greatness of Austria was to be built on the alliance between the nationalities of Hungary and the central government of Greater Austria, on the military occupation of Hungary, on the incorporation of Serbia in order to balance the Magyar element and on the defeat of Italy, which was admitted to and probably would provoke opposition to these designs on the Balkan Peninsula.²

For a justification of this policy the Austrian propaganda constantly called the attention to the separation movement in Hungary, to the bellicose policy of both Serbia and Italy. As to Hungary we must state that the Coalition Government of 1906-10 was on the basis of the Dualism and therefore it was supported by the King; furthermore the difference lay between the King and the Crown Prince, the latter being inclined towards the Generalstab working for the destruction of the Dualism, and in that interest he thought to turn the nationalities of Hungary against the Magyars, and with the precedent of 1848 to occupy the Crown-lands of St. Stephen by Austrian forces. It was at this time that, owing to the complete failure of the Crown Prince's General Franchise Bill,³ the „liberation“ of the nationalities suddenly appeared in the Press of Europe radiated everywhere from the Vienna bureau where the new war against

¹ 6. April 1907, Memorandum of General Conrad Ibid. Page 505.

² Ibid. Pp. 72, 503—10, 527 et seq.

³ Ibid. Page 75.

old Francis Joseph, his Dual System and his Kingdom of Hungary was fought.¹

The friends of the Crown Prince were not aware that a grave internal question is ever the most serious barrier in the way of a vigorous foreign policy. If the Prince wanted war against aggressive neighbours, the primary condition thereof was to settle every question inside the frontiers. But he wanted to restore the Great Austria of Prince Schwartzenberg on the ruins of the Dual System, and to fight victorious wars against other nations. His great error lay in ignoring the fact that the Dual Monarchy united two states but only one nation; and that the silent struggle of this nation for its own safety and welfare was able to prevent a return to the mediaeval autocracy of the old Austrian *patrimonium*, based on the self-sacrifice of nations for the cheap price of a general franchise uniting all *Volksstämme* in a *Volksarmee* and in one Empire.

120. When on the 1st December 1907 the Common Cabinet Council first dealt with the annexation of Bosnia-Hercegovina, Baron Burián, the Common Minister of Finances (a relative of Count Khuen-Héderváry and of Count Tisza) proposed a large autonomy based on the Serb population. The Chief of the *Generalstab* was not present, but he had sought alliance with the Croats and he wanted to balance the Serbophil policy of Budapest by an Austro-Croat alliance.

We must now return to the policy of the Hungarian Government.

¹ Ibid. Page 159.

In Croatia-Slavonia the majority of Ante Starchevich was replaced by an Unionist Party recruited among the Serbs and so the Serb penetration was promoted by the Hungarian Government. The Coalition Government took over the policy of its predecessors as a whole, so that the Generalstab found a natural ally in the Croats, the natural enemies of the Hungaro-Serb alliance.

The Generalstab consequently turned against the Serbs and in the summer of 1908 Conrad was ready to advance nearly to Old Serbia.

But at the Cabinet Council of 19th August only the annexation was voted; the Sandjak of Novibazar (the remnant of Count Goluchowsky's unfortunate policy) was given back to the Turks and so Montenegro and Serbia were able to unite; the policy of conquest was given up and the two men of the Crown Prince were found in opposition to each other.

During the Bosnian crisis Hungary remained quiet, as there were never signs of opposition. The suspicion of the Generalstab was the artificial basis of its Imperialist tendencies; it was upon the old hate against Hungary, that United Austria was to be built.

121. Moreover the Royal Government had its great faults.

It was a Coalition Cabinet based upon several groups of the majority. Among them the Independents had a majority, but the moderates were nearer to the Constitutional Party led by Count Andrassy than to the radicals led by Julius Justh.

The first programme was that of the franchise prescribed by the pact of 8th April 1906, but the Plural Franchise Bill of Count Andrassy was rejected by a majority. Justh now proposed to deal with the Army

Question, but it met with opposition at the Court, and the radicals took up the question of a separate State Bank to be inaugurated on the first day of 1911.

On that question the Coalition barque was wrecked, and on 17th January 1910 Wekerle resigned.

XXIII. Fall of the Dual System. 1911—1918.

122. It was now the old King-Emperor Francis Joseph who came to the rescue of his Dual Empire.

Among the Crown Prince and his Generalstab relying on the nationalities on the one side, and the Independents on the other, he turned to those who wanted, like himself, to maintain the Compromise of 1867 as it was created by the great men of the Sixties.

He appealed to Count Stephen Tisza.

On 17th January 1910 Count Khuen-Héderváry was appointed Premier, and on 19th February Count Tisza founded the Party of National Work.

On the 3rd March at Nagyvárad, on the 6th at Szeged, on the 13th at Arad, on the 19th at Budapest, on the 10th April at Debreczen, on the 16th at Sopron, on the 17th at Szombathely, on the 24th at Szatmár, on the 30th at Kolozsvár, on the 4th May in his own district Ugra, on the 8th at Sárospatak and Sátoraljaujhely, on the 11th at Aranyosmarót and Beszterczébánya, on the 16th at Nagyszalonka, on the 19th at Arad, on the 22nd at Halas, on the 24th at Szarvas, on the 30th at Hajduböszörmény he made his memorable speeches containing the fullest national programme which could possibly be included in the compromise.

As a result he received a majority of 248 and the opposition was split into nine several groups.

Count Apponyi and Kossuth commanded only 48, Justh 39, Count Andrassy more or less, the nationalities only 7 seats, and the King-Emperor came himself on the 25th June to read the speech from the Throne in the Royal Palace at Budapest.

Count Tisza was determined to face all the enemies of his own person and of the Dual System.

The leaders of the opposition were separated by a Parliamentary custody; the nationalities were condemned to silence, not because he did not acknowledge them, but because he only welcomed them when they were joined to one of the great political parties and did not stand apart as racial groups confronting other races; and the Socialists were not satisfied by the franchise law of 1913, however it replaced an old law and was better than nothing.

123. If he failed, he did not fail in Hungary, where his iron hand ruled, because however strong it might be, he never used it against justice.

He failed in Croatia, where he appealed to the Croats instead of the Serbs and his friend, Banus Nicholas Tomasich was unable to get a majority.

That majority favoured Austria.

He failed in Austria, where the general franchise at last created a majority, which opened the way of Federalism.

And he failed against the superstate created by the Austrian Centralists, because they had at last arrived at the door through which great and united Austria was visible: the War.

124. We cannot relate here the history of those events which led up to the Great War, but we must illustrate the policy of Hungary and of her Government in relation to Foreign Policy.

The War Propaganda of the victorious Entente was well organised, but it was not consequent and above all it lacked unity.

Chronologically we see the War break out firstly because Germany invaded Belgium, and later that it was fought for the liberation of the nationalities.

We were at first informed that those who were to be liberated were the non-German population of Germany and Austria and the non-Magyar elements of Hungary; but at the close of the War we heard with surprise that as Alsace-Lorraine was to be restored to France, by the same rule all the territories were only to be reunited with other countries.

There was certainly an error in the account as the Hungarian Counties inhabited by the nationalities never belonged to those countries to which they have been annexed; but the curious answer vouchsafed was that the fact of possession for a thousand years gives no title to continued possession. When ever any one enquired as to the origin of this harsh sentence, he was sure to learn about „the oppression of the nationalities in Hungary“.

But a historian cannot allow himself to be led astray by a propaganda, and he may well suppose that it was only one phase of one great question, and that the origin, the operation and the tendency of this propaganda literature, all concealed in ambitions which strove for full realisation.

We must return to our previous statement that the situation of the Dual Monarchy became serious.

The Dual System existed, but it was only maintained by Hungary and her old King Francis Joseph.

Austria lost her national character and was governed contrary to her Constitution.

When Count Aehrenthal died, the way lay open before the warlike policy of the Austrian Centralists awaiting the arrival of Crown Prince Francis Ferdinand.

The Centralist relied upon Germany, which prepared her way thorough Turkey towards Baghdad and India, while the Slav majority looked to Holy Russia arming for a terrible war on her western frontiers.

And every one's attention was on the Balkan Peninsula, where the Germans and the Slavs would probably meet in deadly combat.

The above mentioned watchwords of the War were not yet used. But there was Count Tisza who, in his Memorandum of 12th July 1910, submitted to the Throne by the last Parliament of the Realm of St. Stephen, addressed the King in these terms: „It is to our obvious interest that we do not want the hegemony of the Balkan Peninsula, and that we do not even agree to a partition, since our vital interest lie in the development free and independent of the nations living on the Balkan Peninsula and in their not being subject to the hegemony of one great Power whatever. This principle was introduced into the political evolution of Europe by the Hungarian nation: it is therefore to the vital interest of those small states that in the Dual Monarchy the present system would remain intact, because the influence of the Hungarian nation upon the Foreign Policy is only assured by the Dualism.“

This amounted to a declaration of war on the high military circles of Vienna on the one hand and on Russian Imperialism on the other, and Hungary remained a passive onlooker of both ambitions nearing the Balkan Peninsula.

Russia appeared first on the scene, and in 1911-12 a Balkan League was formed, which expelled the Turks from Europe. At the end of the first War Bulgaria left the alliance, but in the second Balkan War she lost everything, and in 1913 a second Balkan League was formed including Roumania, the last ally of the Dual Monarchy. The influence of Vienna was replaced by that of St. Petersburg and Tsar Nicholas II visited a Roumanian port in June 1914. At the same time Archduke Francis Ferdinand came down to Sarajevo, where on the 28th June he was murdered by Servian agents.

125. It is wellknown that the late Crown Prince was not generally popular in Hungary and that the Hungarian nation looked with great anxiety to the future, when he should to ascend the throne. No one however doubted that a difference had arisen between the great Dual Monarchy and little Servia which must be settled without delay.

We shall not go too far if we state that this settlement was an opportunity which the high military circles impatiently waited for during the last decade, and that the *Generalstab* was at any moment ready to open the long desired war against the Servian Kingdom.

But on this point we must make a difference between Hungary and Austria. The whole literature written in justification of the partition of the Realm of St. Stephen describes the Premier of Hungary as the author of the Servian War and later on this theory was fully endorsed by the Austrian Centralists. This was necessary to convince Western public opinion that the partition of Hungary would be right and proper. But the whole idea was false.

In the Red Book published by the Socialist Government of Austria, after the death of Count Tisza we find two statements of historical importance.

The one is that the attitude of the high military circles at Vienna was thoroughly bellicose and that at the Common Cabinet Council of 7th July at Vienna one man only spoke against the War and that man was the Premier of Hungary, Count Stephen Tisza.¹

It was an Austrian, Count Berchtold, who was weak enough to give way to the War against Serbia; it was an Austrian, Baron Giessl, who instead of accepting the Servian answer as a ground for discussion among the Powers of Europe, left the Servian capital; and it was Count Czernin, the man of Francis Ferdinand, who in order to buy over the Roumanians, promised them without the sanction of the Royal Government certain parts of Hungary, which was to him a hated nation.²

The forces that worked for a general conflagration in Europe being greater than the negative policy of one Minister of the Dual Monarchy, the War broke out, and he was then unable to remain in opposition.

If any one holds this an inconsequence and an error, he must nevertheless not doubt that Count Tisza stood faithfully on the ground of the Compromise, and that such a man as he was could never betray his friend, his ally, and his sovereign. He was justified in his attitude when the Hungarian

¹ R. Gooss op. cit. Page 52 et seq. and 62 et seq. The Minutes of the Cabinet Council are published in English: Hungary and the World War. A secret document. Budapest 1921.

² Count Czernin op cit. passim.

nation had followed its destiny into that terrible war, where it had nothing to gain and everything to lose.

126. Much has been written about Hungary's interest in the War, but now the whole investigation can be reduced to the chronicling of a few important facts of the past century.

The Kingdom of Hungary being an ideal geographical and historical unit, the nation never hankered after new provinces lying outside her borders; she was merely anxious to hold the frontiers for her own safety.

On this account Hungary opposed the German Imperialism endorsed by the Austrian Centralist on the West, and she kept an anxious eye on the Russian Imperialism in the East. She fought a defensive war, and the Russian invasion proved her justification.

It was because of this that, when by the puerile strategy of Baron Conrad, the standard bearer of Great Austria, the Army was led to occupy Serbia and he was forced to retire after a useless piece of child's play because the Armies of the North were swept away and the Russians were marching to Vienna and crossing the Carpathians, Count Tisza appeared at the German headquarters and demanded either help for the defence of Hungary or ask immediate opening of peace negotiations.

The Germans were not accustomed to being spoken to in that peremptory style; nevertheless the man commanded Hungary and the Dual Monarchy also.

127. Parliamentary Government was never in accor-

dance with the Austrian tradition and while the *Reichsrath* held no sessions, the Hungarian Parliament was the only place where the political situation of the Dual Monarchy was discussed.

The balance of power settled for a while at Budapest and through Count Tisza gained an unrivalled influence in all state affairs.

On the 28th July 1914 Parliament was adjourned and on the 2nd August the new Crown Prince, Archduke Charles Francis Joseph, visited the capital of Hungary.

The first session of the War was held from 25th November to 9th December and was ever memorable for the manifestation of all parties, including the independent Party led by Count Michael Károlyi, who only two months before had arrived from his American tour and from the French prison in which he had been detained.

On New Year's Day Count Tisza declared in a speech that the age of the Centralists had gone and the Dual System was justified by the War.

On 13th January Count Leopold Berchtold, the Common Foreign Minister was replaced by Baron Stephen Burián, a relative of Count Tisza, who from that time controlled the Foreign Affairs also.

On 2nd September the Premier headed a great deputation to King Francis Joseph at Schönbrunn, in Austria, composed of delegates of every County and shortly after, in November 1915 he asked the King to finish the War by a worthy peace, but his proposition was rejected by the military circles.¹

The third session held from the 30th November

¹ 4. December 1915. Cf. W. Fraňkovič op. cit. Page 50.

to the end of March 1916 witnessed the occupation of Montenegro and Servia, the fourth (opened on the 1st June) that of Roumania

Since the great campaign of Poland, where the Russian Power collapsed and the Russian danger disappeared, public opinion held that the War could be finished by a just peace guaranteeing the safety of the Realm of St. Stephen; after the occupation of Servia, Montenegro and Roumania, the Royal Government accepted the general desire and on 12th December Count Tisza, in the fifth session of Parliament, announced that an offer had been sent to the Powers on the other side.

Old Francis Joseph had been dead a fortnight and the Dual Monarchy had another King-Emperor, Charles IV. King of Hungary and Charles I Emperor of Austria. It was Count Tisza who placed the Crown of St. Stephen upon the head of the young Monarch, and it was hoped that after the occupation of Southern Roumania the fateful war would be ended.

But just now the question of submarine warfare was raised in German military circles, and Count Tisza opposed it in vain. The fifth session closed amid general dissatisfaction (12th April 1917).

128. From that day Count Tisza ceased to contro. the situation.

King Charles IV., who on the evening of his Coronation returned to Vienna, came under the influence of Count Czernin, who since 22nd December had been Minister of Foreign Affairs and of the Household.

Count Czernin also sought peace, but his peace signified a return to the Great Austria of Francis Ferdinand

On 25th April Count Károlyi inaugurated his Democratic Club in the interest of a full democratisation; on the 28th a Royal letter was published advocating extension of the franchise, and on 1st May the workers demonstrated in favour of universal suffrage. On the 8th Count Károlyi endorsed their demand and Count Tisza was willing to accept 300,000 electors more than those allowed by the Franchise Law of 1913. The Vienna circles however were not satisfied and Count Tisza resigned on the 23rd.

On 6th June the Universal Suffrage League was founded by Count Károlyi's friends, the Democrats and the Socialists, and on the 8th Count Maurice Esterházy formed a Cabinet uniting prominent members of the Independent Party and also the Democrat William Vázsonyi. On the 10th the Pest County Assembly rejected Universal suffrage by 194 to 33, but when on the 21st the Cabinet appeared before Parliament and agreed to accept the year 24 in place of 27 as the limit of the right of election, Count Tisza was ready to grant everything by his majority, so that the nation should be united in the War, and he left for the front.

On the 20th August Count Esterházy was succeeded by Alexander Wekerle, and on the 6th February 1918 a new party was formed under the name of „The party of 1848 and of the Constitution” uniting both Count Andrassy and Apponyi for cooperation with the majority led by Count Tisza. On this new party Count Károlyi declared war, but on 24th July the Franchise Bill was passed by Parliament.

129. This new restoration clearly showed that Hungary had again parted with the Austrian system.

But on this point already signs of a complete dissolution appeared on the horizon.

The Central Powers were unable to break through the ring of their enemies. Unsuccessful strategy combined with the lack of food rendered victory impossible. Moreover, a decisive victory was possible only at the beginning of the War when the great armies met: after the battle of the Marne all hopes of victory vanished. The activity of the Central Powers was limited to a desperate defence, (the cardinal point of Hungary's attitude in the War from its beginning, which was included by Count Tisza in the Protocol of the Common Cabinet Council of 7th July 1914) and the heroic defence gave several opportunities for a settlement.

Count Tisza was ready to make peace in 1915, but he met opposition in Austria, which at length became the lord of the land beyond the Save and organised in the occupied territory an Austro-Croat administration. He was ready to make peace also in 1916 and 1917, but it met further opposition in German military circles, which prepared a relentless war against the British.

The War could only be finished by complete exhaustion of one side or the other, and that exhaustion was manifested in the Central Powers after old King Francis Joseph's decease.

His strong man, the last paladin of the Compromise of 1867, no longer occupied the important post he had held during the last six years: the new party formed in 1918 was a minority only, while the majority was put aside by the Court.

On that point the Austrian Centralists revived, and Count Czernin, the last man of the late Crown Prince

renewed the demand for Universal suffrage. It was more important that on this platform he should foil the skilful propaganda of the enemy.

On 11th May 1918 an interpellation was made in the Parliament with regard a German Major who had been ordered to Budapest to control the secret connections of the Opposition. The leader of the Opposition was then Count Michael Károlyi, the advocate of complete democratisation, which meant nothing less than complete disarmament of the exhausted armies by their own peoples.

On that point Militarism faced Revolution.

At the psychological moment on 16th October 1918, when Parliament met, Count Károlyi appealed to the King for a new Government, and in the night the old majority of Count Tisza joined hands with the minority led by Counts Andrássy and Apponyi, uniting all the moderates against the common danger.

On the 17th an Imperial manifesto transformed the Austrian Empire into a Federal State composed of independent states, and on that same day Count Tisza rose in Parliament and, declaring that the War was lost, he added that Hungary's relations with Federal Austria henceforth were based on Personal Union alone.

At the Cabinet Council of the 21st the Bill of Personal Union was drawn up, but on the 22rd Count Károlyi demanded a declaration of complete independence. In the afternoon Count Tisza replied and in the night the moderate parties amalgamated.

On the 23rd Wekerle resigned and on the following day Baron Burian the Minister of Foreign Affairs was succeeded by Count Julius Andrássy the younger.

The Royal family was at the palace of Gödöllő,

where on the 25th many politicians were received in turn; a Cabinet with Count Károlyi at the head, met with unsurmountable opposition, but while no one was appointed, a National Council was founded the same evening under the presidency of the Count. The *Nemzeti Tanács* was made on the model of the *Honvédelmi Bizottmány* of 1848 with the sole difference that it was an independent Government of a country to be liberated; in its composition and in its policy it proved fatal, representing merely a minority of the nation and the radical elements of the capital only.

On the 27th King Charles left for Vienna, where he was followed by Count Károlyi, who however returned without being received. On the 28th the dissatisfied masses marched on the Royal Castle at Buda, but they were held up on the left side of the Iron Bridge, where a collision with the police took place.

On that day the *Zweibund* of 1879 was dissolved by the last Foreign Minister of the Dual Monarchy, the son of its creator, Count Julius Andrássy the Younger.¹

On the 29th Count John Hadik was ready to form a moderate Cabinet with the exclusion of the *Nemzeti Tanács*, but his power was limited to the capital only, where on that day the *Nemzeti Tanács* was joined by the police.

On the 30th Count Hadik took over what remnant of power he was able to command, but the real

¹ Count Andrássy op. cit. Pp. 211—12 His answer to the German General Van Cramon appeared in the UMS Vol. I. Budapest 1920 et seq. Pp. 200.

power was already transferred to the streets. The military buildings were occupied and in the night of the 31st Count Károlyi was by telephone entrusted not only with the formation of a Cabinet but with the full civil and military powers also.

On that rainy night of 31st October the last pillar of the Compromise of 1867 was murdered in his home, and henceforth the Government of Hungary was transferred to the headquarters of the enemy forces, whence complete democratisation was initiated.

XXIV. Partition of Hungary.

1915—1920.

131. It is now generally admitted that Hungary had the least part in the responsibility for the Great War, and that she nevertheless has received the severest punishment. While Germany retains the bulk of her population and remains still a Power able to restore her material strength, Hungary has been reduced to one-third of her former territory and deprived of most of her raw materials, on which alone her hope of a better future depended.

Cause and effect not being reconcilable in this case, history must believe that her dismemberment was not the result of Hungary's attitude in the War, but was due to the greed and the tyrannous will of her enemies.

In this respect the Great Alliance against the Central Powers seemed hardly a compact body, and on this point at least it lacked unity and concentration.

In 1914 the Allied Powers turned against Berlin,

of which Vienna was merely a faithful follower, Germany opposing the bulk of the Alliance on her Western and Eastern fronts, and pressing on Turkey, Roumania and Bulgaria in order to have a safe corridor towards Baghdad and India.

The Berlin Baghdad route was to be severed by Russia. But if this was important for England, it was more important for France that her Russian ally should turn attention to Berlin and head off the Germans from the Rhine, while Russia chose a third way, when she abandoned both routes and moved for the Carpathians, as in crossing them she realised the dream of Peter the Great.

On that route the Slavs, who have looked up to her since the Bosnian Annexation, were always silenced by her with a secret promise. It was not only the Servians who appealed to the Tsar, the Czechs joined also and a powerful propaganda connected the Northern with the Southern Slavs.

The French accepted this Slav programme as the only way by which the German peril could be averted, but the Franco-Slav alliance was only accepted by England on condition that the non-Slav peoples should also join. She turned attention to Italy, Greece and Roumania, as to replace the German predominance by a Slav Power on the Mediterranean would amount to a defeat.

Against Russian hegemony the only barrier being Austro-Hungary which had a mixed population, British public opinion preferred regional autonomy to the two extremes, the rule of a German minority and the formation of a mighty Slav State or Federation on the ruins of the weak Monarchy of the Habsburgs.

It was because of this that on 5th January 1918 Lloyd George declared that „the break-up of Austria-Hungary is no part of our war aims” and it was because this that by the Armistice Treaty of 3rd November signed at Padua Hungary's territorial integrity was upheld by the victorious Powers contrary to the programme published by the Franco-Slav propaganda.

132. The full programme of this propaganda was worked out by the neighbouring states interested in the partition.

For these experts in the internal politics of the Dual Empire the greatest barrier in the way of success was Hungary, and it was by this way that „la voix de Tisza et de la noblesse magyare” entered Western mentality.¹

The origin of this programme could hardly be traced, but after the Czech Eduard Benes fled to Paris in the autumn of 1915, he published a pamphlet with the conclusion: „L'Autriche-Hongrie doit être démembrée . . . Détruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie! Unissez les Tchéco-Slovaques et les Yougo-Slaves!”² Thus the key of the mystery will be found not far from Bohemia.

On 15th April 1916 Benes met Masaryk in London, where the first sketch of Czecho-Slovak Federation was made, fully treated in Seton-Watson's „New Europe”, a periodical consecrated to the Franco-Slav programme, while the famous Memorandum of the former stated that the day of the

¹ Take Jonescu: The origins of the War The testimony of a witness. London, 1917.

² E. Benes, Détruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie! Paris, 1916.

Slavs had at last arrived, and the Franco-Slav programme was developed into a Pan Slav dream.¹

The „status quo of 1915“, laid down in the slavophil works of Ernest Denis and Seton-Watson, contemplated a *Greater Bohemia* incorporating Slovakia and through the Ruthenian Counties stretching to the Russian frontier, with a *Greater Serbia* incorporating Southern Hungary and connected with Bohemia by a corridor through Western Hungary; with a *Greater Roumania* incorporating not only Transylvania, but also parts of the great Hungarian plain, but on the other part bordered by Serbia in the West, Bohemia in the North and Russia on the East, under Slav control and influence. It was Russia therefore who gave life to the programme by which the dream of Pan Slavism was to be realised, and who became the arbiter of Eastern Europe.²

133. The long struggle of the Czech nation for independence ever commanded the sympathy of the

¹ H. Kuffner: *Náš stát a svelovy mir*. Prague, 1918.

² The first maps were published by the French *Illustration* (1914) and by the Serb B. Nikashinovitch in the *Petermann's Mitteilungen* (1920) and in Kuffner op. cit. The new frontiers of Hungary were traced by Ernest Denis: *La grande Serbie* Paris, 1915. Pag. 302, relating to Southern Hungary; by the same: *La question d'Autriche Les slovaques*. Paris, 1917. Pp. 259—60 and 273, relating to Northern and Western Hungary, by R. W. Seton-Watson: *Roumania and the Great War* London, 1915. Pp. 95—97, relating to Eastern Hungary. These frontiers are identical with those laid down in the Peace Treaty of Trianon, 4th June 1920. For particulars of the programme cf. „New Europe“, edited by R. W. Seton-Watson, published at London in 1916—1919.

Magyars, as both nations had fought hand-in-hand against German supremacy and oppression. Even in 1918 sympathy existed towards Bohemia, when on the 28th October she regained her independence, since an independent Bohemia could not be enemy of Hungary.

The alienation lay in the circumstance that in the status quo of 1915 Bohemia had incorporated Western Hungary, Slovakia, and the Ruthenian Counties, and that she became a powerful link in the chain of Pan Slavism. It was therefore not Hungary who turned against the Czechs, but Bohemia who was transformed into *Tcheco-Slovakia* in order to justify the annexation of Slovakia, those fertile Counties on the left bank of the Danube, and the advance of the Slavs to the Mediterranean on Hungarian territory. Hungary had never a Czech population, and so the *Tcheco-Slovak* denomination is an interference which later led to the Czech Control of the Slovak population of Southern Hungary on the supposition that the whole of Hungary would be controlled by the Czechs.

The Memorandum of 1917 referred with anxiety to the fact that the map of the new state showed a *torso* and the authors looked for guarantees. The first guarantee proposed was the reduction by coercive measures of the German population in *Tcheco-Slovakia*; the second the partition of Germany; the third that of the Dual Monarchy as follows: Bohemia united with Moravia and Silesia, will annex the left bank of the Danube from Regensburg to Budapest; south of the Danube there will be an economic formation consisting of German Austria on the West and Western Hungary on the East, the former

under a Czech, the latter under a Serb administration. Triest and Fiume should belong to the Slavs, while the Magyars should receive a reservation where (in the words of the Memorandum) „once the Cumanian and Jazyg tribes lived”.¹

The Great Powers were not prepared to endorse these unbounded ambitions and to creat a Slav instead of a German *Mitteleuropa* founded in racial hatred and slavery, and the Czechs were clever enough to moderate their demands in order that they might be realised.

In the *Department of Propaganda in Enemy Countries* formed in February 1918 at Crewe House in London, the director of the Austro-Hungarian section, Seton-Watson, also ignored them in order to save and to give full weight to the moderate programme of 1915, including the non-Slav elements of South-Eastern Europe and their not being sacrificed to a Slav supremacy.

On his recommendation the head of Crewe House, Lord Northcliffe on 24th February proposed to Lord Balfour, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that — in opposition to Lloyd George's statement of 5th January last cited above — „statements to the effect that the Allies do not wish to dismember Austria should be avoided”, and that hereafter „the Bohemian and Yougoslav agencies already existing should be utilised”.²

This plain language of the Franco-Slav propaganda was duly accepted by Lord Balfour on 26th February

¹ Kulfner op. cit. passim.

² C. Stuart: *Secrets of Crewe House* The story of a famous campaign, London 1920.

„The complete break — up of the Austrian Empire — the final goal of our efforts“, and on 26th February 1919 the programme was sanctioned by the Paris Conference.

On 4th November Lord Northcliffe went further when he declared that the Fourteen Points of President Wilson „cannot be understood as a full recitation of the conditions of peace“ and demanded „in the full conviction of the power and the will of the Associated Powers to distinguish explicitly between principles and conditions that must be accepted as indisputable“, and he made indisputable the union of the nationalities of Hungary on both sides of her historical boundaries.¹

134. That principle was obviously contrary to the Treaty of Armistice signed at Padua just one day before Lord Northcliffe's report was published in the *London Times*.

We have now a full description of the transactions, but as to the interpretation the Treaty itself, we have two opponent views.

According to the interpretation of the majority, the whole of Austria-Hungary was understood in Article III. which orders the „*évacuation de tout territoire envahi par l'Autriche-Hongrie depuis le début de la*

Stuart op. cit. Pp. 210 et seq. Lord Northcliffe; From War to Peace. The Times 4th November 1918.

² Cf. the particulars given General H. Kerchnawe. *Der Zusammenbruch der oesterreichisch-Ungarischen Wehrmacht im Herbst 1918*. München, 1921, passim. Colonel F. Nyékhegyi: *The Diaz Armistice Treaty. (Treaty of Padua)*. Budapest 1922 (Hung.) The colonel signed the Treaty as only Hungarian.

guerre," while the line of evacuation extended from Southern Tirol to Dalmatia, the South-Western frontier of the Dual Monarchy, and thus the integrity of Hungary was upheld by the treaty.¹

According to the minority the line described in Article III. of the Padua Treaty referred only to the South-Western part of the Dual Empire.

It can now be stated that there was only one Treaty of Armistice concluded between the Allied Powers and Austria-Hungary on 3rd November and that this treaty referred to an armistice with the whole Dual Empire; its title ran as follows „*Protocole des conditions d'Armistice entre les Puissances Alliées et Associées et l'Autriche-Hongrie*".² Article IV. should be decisive in the question when it declared that the German troops existing in Austria-Hungary should return home: „non seulement des fronts d'Italie et des Balkans, mais de tous les territoires austro hongrois".

By the treaty a new status quo was created at Padua similar to that created at Spaa for Germany: a status quo never denied or revoked by the Allied Powers.

135. But the minor Allies interested in the partition of Hungary having been left out of that Treaty, they were now anxious to destroy its validity.

The time was short and the Hungarian troops returned determined to protect the frontiers of their home-land

¹ Interpretation of the only Hungarian present, Colonel Nyékhegyi (op. cit.), and of the Italian Delegation (Kerchnawer op. cit. Pag. 140.)

² Published by Colonel Nyékhegyi op. cit. Pp. 62 73

There they received orders to lay down their arms; and these orders were sent by the Revolutionary Government.

When on 2nd November the Minister for War of this Government made the astounding observation that he never wished to see soldiers again, Benes seemed to answer him in the *Paris Matin*, and it was published in the *London Times* on the following day that „the Czechs must occupy the whole of Slovakia militarily, because Bolshevism is most threatening in Hungary”.¹

And so we get the first „because” of the partition on the Fifth of November 1918. This „because” was a prompt and sincere „because” discovered in haste, and we were obliged to wait until 1919, when another „because” was invented by the Prague Academy of Sciences, and this new „because” appeared to be the reunion: the reunion of the Slovaks with the Czechs.

The reunion of Southern Hungary with Serbia only appeared in the Serb propaganda in the first years of the new century. We expect the Serbs will smile at reading in a book on Temesvár, that town described as „le berceau des anciens voyvodes et princes serbes”,² as no Servian voyvodes or princes ever born in that place and the name *Voyvodina* was only applied to Southern Hungary by the Austrians in 1848 when the Serbs were to assist them against the Magyars.

Transylvania was claimed simply on the pretext

¹ *Le Matin*, 5th September 1918, *Times*, 6th September 1918.

² S. Juge: *La paix de 1916*. Paris, 1915. Page 141.

that it was incorporated into the Roman Empire by Emperor Trajan in 106 A. B.; and this title seemed sufficient for its annexation by Roumania, a state only created by that name in 1860, while the fact that the present Roumanians are not identical with the Romans of Trajan, and that the former did not appear until the XIIIth Century on Hungarian soil possessed exclusively by Hungarians for ten Centuries, was not recognised by the Peace Conference. Roumanian propaganda triumphed and we read again the words of Virgil applied to the achievement: „*Tantae molis erat Romaniam condere gentem*“.¹

On the day of the Armistice of Padua however these reunions were not yet officially published; Bolshevism was the sole title by which our neighbors asked to be permitted to invade the land of the retiring enemy from every direction.

The Allied Powers were bound by the fatal treaty made on the 3rd November at Padua and it was impossible for them to declare it a „scrap of paper“. They lacked a formality which they were unable to obtain in order to meet the demands of the minor Allies, to whom they were bound by the war and the victory.

And it was on that critical ground that the Revolutionary Government of Hungary announced that General Weber had been entrusted by the Hungarian Government to treat in the name of Hungary also,² the Italian Generalissimo, General Diaz, repre-

¹ Les questions roumaines du temps présent. Paris, 1921.

² The telegramm was published by General Rubint op. cit. Pag. 206

senting the Allied Powers,¹ and fact of the signature was duly communicated on the 3rd November and received at Budapest in due course.²

The Treaty was therefore not unknown to the Hungarian Government, who intended to send out a special commission to General Franchet d'Espèray at Belgrade, who had similarly received from Paris instructions relative to the Padua Treaty.

The special delegation under the personal lead of Count Michael Károlyi arrived at Belgrade on the 6th, and the General on the 7th November. A Memorandum was there and then presented, in which the validity of the Padua Treaty was called in question.

This declaration amounted to *carte blanche*, on which new terms were dictated by the French General, and by this new convention the situation was changed. But as he had received instructions exclusively for military and not for political arrangements, Minister Linder waited two days at Belgrade, until on the night of the 13th General Henrys arrived and some time before midnight he was able to sign the convention.

General Franchet d'Espèray with held his signature, while the French General Henrys and the Serb Mishitch were not authorised by the Allied Powers.

This convention did not receive the name of an Armistice Treaty: it remained a „*Convention Militaire*“.

¹ Padua, 2nd November 1918. Telegramm of the Armistice Commission. Published *ibid.* Page 325.

² Padua, 3rd November 1918. Published *ibid.* Pag. 210 and 327. In the archive of the Ministry of War the telegrams received and number ed 28.083, 28.179 and 28.327.

based not upon the Treaty of Armistice but upon previous secret treaties made for the partition of Hungary.

With regard to the coming into existence of the Belgrade Convention, the French lieutenant-colonel Paul Azan has given an interesting picture.

The *new armistice* was made in the name but without the legal representation of Hungary for the purpose of supporting unknown secret treaties not sanctioned by either the Padua Treaty or the population.

Even the Entente was surprised and the General did not arrive until next day by aeroplane in order to meet the deputation humbly asking for an armistice however grave its consequences for Hungary. The General was struck by the behaviour of the delegates and treated them with contempt. A new Treaty of Armistice was at once drawn up by the Servian General Mishits, who received *carte blanche* for the Servian ambitions; and it was duly signed on the 8th by Mishitch and on the 13th by the French General Henrys, the Servian Voyvode, and Béla Linder, the Minister for War of the Revolutionary Government.

As for the Treaty dictated by Voyvode Mishitch it detached the Southern Counties and divided them between Servia and Roumania. The former received rich Counties and large Hungarian towns including Versecz, Temesvár, Szabadka, Baja and Pécs; the latter, where the Allied Powers were represented by General Berthelot, acquired the Eastern and Southern Counties of Transylvania,

including the pure Magyar Székely and the Saxon settlements.¹

The circumstances leading up to the Belgrade treaty are therefore unknown, but as to its object we may refer to the English history of the Paris Peace Conference where read that „drawn up as it was by the Franco-Serbian Command, this convention took sufficient account of Serbian requirements; and allowed the Serbs to occupy an area in the South of Hungary which went beyond their territorial claims!”²

When on the following day, 14th November, Colonel Nyékhegyi arrived at Budapest and brought the Padua Treaty signed by him, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs asked for his papers and concealed both Treaties as long as he could.³ It was not until the 24th December that the Belgrade Treaty was published by the Government.

This happened owing to the different content of the treaties, but investigation soon showed a formal difference also because the Treaty of Padua is designated an „*Armistice entre les Puissances Alliées et Associées et Autriche-Hongrie*”, that of Belgrade only a „*Convention Militaire*” made for the application of the former. If that application completely changed the contents of the former, there

¹ Published in the Hungarian Peace Negotiations. Report of the Hungarian Delegation at Neuilly. Vol. I. Budapest 1920. Page 306 Cf. Lieutenant-Colonel P. Azan.: *L'armistice avec la Hongrie*. L'illustration, 5. Novembre 1921.

² H. W. V. Temperley: *A history of the Peace Conference of Paris*. Vol. I. London 1920. Page 352.

³ Colonel Nyékhegyi op. cit. Page 61.

remains the question open as to the validity of the latter.

In fact the territorial integrity of the country was floated and the invasion began.

136. The two French Generals Franchet d'Espérey and Berthelot at once crossed the frontier at the head of the Servian and Roumanian Armies and the Balkan forces occupied Hungary up to the line of demarcation as defined by the Belgrade Convention. The I. and II. Servian Armies arrived on the 1st November at the Danube-Save line, leaving back two hundred miles, and confronted the Army of General Kövess. The Roumanians confronted the 28 divisions standing in Transylvania and the two hundred thousand Germans of General Mackensen. The Serbs were exhausted, the passes of the Carpathians were closed: the only way of invasion was afforded by the Belgrade Convention.

The Czechs were unfortunately omitted, but they agitated at Paris and they were soon included by André Tardieu, to whose hands the work of partition was entrusted.¹ On 5th November the first Czech troops left Prague for Hungary and on the same day Czech commissioners appeared at Nagyszombat and demanded the transfer of authority to them. On the 20th the Czech Government advised Count Károlyi that, Slovakia being allotted to Bohemia, Hungary cannot make any Armistice on behalf of her Northern Counties. Not being in possession of any enactment relating to the question, Edward Benes, the Foreign Minister of Bohemia, on 6th December published a note containing the

¹ A. Tardieu: *La paix*. Paris, 1921. Pp. 426—27.

statement that the transactions relating to the late Austro-Hungarian Monarchy took place at Versailles.

And that was deemed ample justification for a general invasion.

On the 11th the Czech, on the 13th the Serb and Roumanian troops entered Hungary from the North, the East and the South.¹

On the 4th December Lieutenant-Colonel Vyx (the highest officer sent to Budapest for the pacification of Hungary, which clearly showed how much value was set on the affair at Paris) acquainted the Revolutionary Government with the Southern frontiers of the Bohemian occupation and demand evacuation accordingly.²

On the same day General Berthelot crossed the line of demarcation defined by the Convention of Belgrade, and on the 20th he gave order for an occupation up to the Máramarosziget-Arad line.³

On the 23rd December Lieutenant-Colonel Vyx made known the new definite frontiers of Slovakia. In vain the Revolutionary Government protested, and published the Belgrade Convention.* On the 25th the Serbs occupied the Peninsula formed by the Drave and Mura rivers. Thus the Belgrade Convention became a scrap of paper and the power passed to the partitioning Allies represented and working at the Paris Conference.

¹ For particulars of the invasion cf. General Rubint op. cit. Pp. 229—268.

² Published in the Hungarian Peace Negotiations Report. Vol. I. 1920.

³ Ibid. Pp. 332 and 334. The Times, 30th Dec. 1918.

⁴ Ibid. Pp. 343—44.

On the 18th November the retiring General Mackensen was ordered to disarm in accordance with the Belgrade Convention, though he was bound by the Armistice concluded at Spaa;¹ on the 16th December he was arrested and interned by order of the Government, but on the 4th January 1919 he was taken into custody by French soldiers on Hungarian territory and escorted by them to Futtak on the Southern Danube.²

When on the 20th March Lieutenant-Colonel Vyx communicated the definite frontiers of Hungary settled at Paris on the 26th February previous, the Government resigned, and on the 21st the power was taken by Count Károlyi, only however to be transferred by him to the Communists.³

In this way complete disarmament led to unopposed invasion, to the Bolshevism clearly foreseen by the invaders as soon as they began to work.

Thus both Treaties of Armistice were nullified and Hungary became a no man's land; the Hungarian nation, by the machinations of her enemies, was denied recognition and excluded from the benefits of International Law.

137. It needs therefore no long investigation to state the cardinal points of the „complete democratisation“ announced in 1918.

It was started by the dissolution of the Indepen-

¹ *M. Luyken* · Generalfeldmarschall von Mackensen. Von Bukarest bis Saloniki. München 1920. Page 51.

² *Ibid.* Pp. 65-67 and 73-75. Report of the Hungarian officer in General Rubint's op. cit. Pp. 198 et seq.

³ Hungarian Peace Negotiations Report. Vol. I 1920 Pp. 352-53.

dent Party, when its president, Count Michael Károlyi (Francis Kossuth having died on 25th May 1914, on 28th Károlyi was elected president) together with his intimate friends turned to Radicalism.

From that day onwards there were only two directions in Hungarian politics: that of the Moderates and that of the Radicals.

The majority led by Count Tisza, the Constitutional Party formed by Count Andrassy and the Independent friends of Count Apponyi were all Moderates; the friends of Count Károlyi and the Socialists were Radicals. Towards the end of the War the Count attached himself more and more to the street, and by that evolution the grave differences existing between the moderate groups disappeared and all the parties standing on historical ground became united in order to attempt to save the ship of historical Hungary in the awful storm which was about to break over it.

In opposition to that concentration Count Károlyi preached his „complete democratisation” doctrine including full disarmament, which could only lead to the partition of the country.

His *Nemzeti Tanács* (National Council), formed on 25th October 1918 united four different kinds of men: 1. his old friends following him from the radical wing of the Independent Party; 2. the new intellectuals, who lacked every relation to historical Hungary, and who by their internationalism were destined and even determined to direct the foreign affairs of the country; 3. the Socialists; and 4. last but not least, a little group which from the beginning was Communist and were in a secret relations with Moscow.

It was therefore a full and progressive democratisation, in which the power passed from the Independents inspired by Louis Kossuth to the Communists directed by Lenin.

No doubt, the great idea of liberation, the formation of a new and independent Hungary won the general sympathy of the nation and so at the beginning the Count had an able staff at his disposal, but the serious elements one by one retired and in four months the Count handed the Government to the Communists.

138. The October Revolution, as the last seven days of October 1918 were called, began with the formation of the *Nemzeti Tanács* and ended with the tragic death of Count Stephen Tisza.

On the 1st November new period began, when Count Károlyi, the last Premier appointed by the King, delivered his oath to the *Nemzeti Tanács* formed under his own presidency, and by that act the sovereignty was transferred from the King to the People, chiefly to those of the capital. The very first act of King Charles's last government was to demand from His Majesty by telephone for his prompt abdication.¹

Politics were at the beginning directed by the Independents, who advocated the long — dreamt — of complete separation from Austria, while the intellectuals by their international character, turned to foreign politics.

¹ Cf. the narration of Prince Louis Windischgraetz, who happened to stand behind the King in the palace of Schönbrunn found quite empty (U. M. Sz.) and by General Rubint op. cit. Page 156

They stood behind the above mentioned declaration forwarded by the Minister for War to the A. O. K. (Armeeoberkommando) on 1st November, when the Austrian Military Centres at last turned their attention to the defence of the Southern frontiers, these being per chance identical with those of the Hungarian Kingdom.¹ On 1st November several divisions were en route to the line commanded by General Kövess since 8 October at Belgrade, and since 1st November at Ujvidék on the Danube. But when the A. O. K. asked the Revolutionary Government „ob die Verteidigung Ungarns durch die Heeresgruppe Feldmarschall Br. Kövess wie bisher an der Donau und Save, oder mit Rücksicht darauf, dass der jugoslavische Staat gebildet hat und dieser an den Kämpfen mit der Entente nicht mehr beteiligt ist, an der Donau und Drave zu erfolgen hat“² the Minister for War gave the order for an absolute disarmament.³ The disarmament was effected by special commissioners sent out to the frontier stations and resulted in a complete military dissolution.⁴

On 3rd November the Government went a step further and Hungary was declared a neutral state, but on that rock the ship of the intellectuals was

¹ It was noteworthy that while the Magyar troops were left in the fire at the Italian front, the new army of Southern Hungary was composed by non-Magyar soldiers. (General Rubint, op. cit. Page 164 163 et seq.

² Published *ibid* Page 164.

³ Published *ibid* Page 317.

⁴ Between 1st and 31st November there were disarmed 16,766 officers, and 563,822 men, returned 5,510 officers and 34,778 men. (*ibid*. Page 343).

wrecked, as they forgot or held it of no importance that neutrality without guarantees is an impossibility in both practice and international law. Hungary being then not recognised by any state in the world, she could not be a neutral state; she was however declared a neutral state without international treaties or an army able to guarantee her neutrality. The intellectuals committed a grave error in thinking that Internationalism was equal to denationalism. Internationalism is not always a negation of nations, but Hungary was on the way to denationalisation, and opened her frontiers to victorious nations, where armed intervention destroyed the vague notion of the intellectuals. This unprecedented confusion led to the partition.

That partition was introduced on 5th November, when the intellectuals, advocating complete autonomy for the nationalities on the Swiss model, began to transform the historical and political unit into a federation of preponderant non-Magyar population inclining towards the states of their kindred, whose armies were already prepared to cross the frontiers.

It was too late for an experiment, because by virtue of the so-called Treaty of Pittsburg, made by the Czech Masaryk, with a few Slovaks living in America on the 30th May 1918 was created a Czecho-Slovak State which he was able to get recognized by President Wilson.¹

When on the 13th Minister Oszkar Jászi left for Arad in order to hold a conference with the Rouma-

¹ The agreement was published and criticised by Z. Szojczényi. How Upper Hungary was lost. Budapest, 1921 (Hung.).

nians, the Royal Roumanian army had already crossed the frontier and on the 14th the conference broke up without any result.¹

On the 16th November the House of Representatives declared its dissolution, but the House of Lords only closed its session. After a short procedure Hungary was declared a Republic: *Magyar Népköztársaság* (Hungarian Republic of the People), the German word *Volksrepublik* being simply translated by the intellectuals.

A fortnight later, on 1st December a meeting was held at Gyulafehérvár, the ancient capital of the *Dacia Provincia* of the Romans (Latin and Roumanian *Alba Julia*), where the Roumanian delegations of the 26 Eastern Counties proclaimed the secession. The German and Magyar populations were not represented. On that occasion a declaration was published, until now the basic law of the Transylvanian and Hungarian provinces of Greater Roumania.²

On the 8th the Royal Roumanian troops crossed the line of demarcation in order to replace it by another line described by the secret treaty of 17th August 1916, in which one third of Hungary was promised to Roumania. On the 27th King Ferdinand annexed all the 26 Counties represented — by their Roumanian delegations — at the meeting of Gyulafehérvár.

¹ For particulars of the interesting communications of the newspapers and recently that of *J. Komáromi Jászai* at Arad U. M. S. Vol. I. 1920 Pp. 27—35.

² The particulars are fully treated by Commissioner Professor Stephen Apáthy: *Transylvania after the collapse*. U. M. S. Vol. II. 1920. Pp. 147—176.

On 10th December the situation being acute, a few hundred Spahis arrived at Budapest, sent by the French, to whose sphere of interest Hungary was allotted. At that time the frontiers of the Kingdom were occupied by the invading neighbours, who together with the troops of occupation took over the public administration, a gross infringement of the Armistice terms and of International Law

On New Year's Day Count Károlyi announced that the World had proved not yet ripe for his pacific dreams and therefore *finis Hungaricae*.

On the 11th however he was invested with the presidency, and Dénes Berinkey formed a new Government.

The regime of the Independents and of the intellectuals came to an end; their Nationality Laws, — that relating to the Ruthenians and promulgated on 21st December 1918 as Law X of 1918, that relating to the Germans promulgated on 28th January 1919 as Law XI of 1919, and that of 11th March 1919 relating to the Slovaks and published as Law XXX of 1919 — lost their practical value.

The turn now came for the group of the more advanced Socialists. They were however unable to take over the Government owing to their minority and in the circumstances they gave way to the Communists, who had ruled the Capital by their terrorism since the tragic death of Count Stephen Tisza

139 The first Communist achievement was the Soldier's Council formed on the 1st November 1918 under the presidency of Joseph Pogány. The second, a Worker's Council founded on the same day at the townhall

These formations were joined by William Böhm, since the 3rd November Secretary of State and since 18th January Minister for War, and Sigismund Kunfi, since 31st October Minister for Public Worship and Education in the Károlyi Cabinet. It was the latter who on 27th December declared war on the independents.

On the 10th January the *Vörös Újság* (Red News) was started and on 19th February the *Népszava* (translated from the German word *Volksstimme*), the official organ of the Socialists, was attacked by the mob led by the Reds, four policeman and one soldier being left dead on the spot. An investigation followed and on the 22nd the leaders of the Communists, including Béla Kun (who had only on the 19th November returned from Russia) and his friends, were arrested. When on 21st March the Government turned to the Reds, Minister Kunfi called on Béla Kun in his prison and an agreement was made between Communists and Socialists, the heir of Count Károlyi's Government.

It was duly accepted by the Count, who that same night handed over his power to the new majority.

The Hungarian Soviet therefore was a Coalition of Socialists and Communists, under the presidency of Alexander Garbai with a long series of Commissioners — (Internal Affairs: Eugene Landier, Education: Sigismund Kunfi, War: Joseph Pogány, Socialisation: William Böhm) most of them being Jews.¹

The particulars of the history of the Hungarian Soviet are fully treated in the valuable book: *A bolsevizmus Magyarországon* (The Bolshevism in Hungary) edited by G. Gritz Budapest, 1921 XXII and 861 pages.

The Soviet relied on Moscow, and once more Hungary lay at the feet of the lord of Russia - in 1849 Tsar Nicholas I, in 1919 Lenin.¹

On the 23rd the police, and on the 24rd *Nemzeti Tanács*, were dissolved; on the 25th Revolutionary Tribunals and Red Army were created, and on the 2nd April a new constitution proclaimed.

On the 28th March Béla Kun announced in a Vienna newspaper² that he did not stand on the ground of the integrity of the Hungarian State, and on the 4th April General Smuts arrived at Budapest. It was noteworthy that the Allies always declined to recognise the *de facto* Government of Hungary and of the Hungarian State until half the country was occupied by the Little Allies interested in her partition. The Powers had no use for a well organised Hungary, and so the Reds were fortunate enough to win over the Peace Conference by the declaration that they renounced the territories occupied. General Smuts proposed a new line of demarcation, instead of the definite frontiers as demanded in the note presented by Lieutenant-Colonel Vyx on 21st March to Count Károlyi. His proposals were however not accepted by Béla Kun, who did not want to renounce the propagation of Bolshevism; and thus General Smuts, who had intended to remain for a fortnight, returned to Paris after a twenty minutes' colloquy.³

¹ Ibid. Page 107.

² Neue Freie Presse, 28 March 1919.

³ Count Julius Andrássy: Foreign Policy of the Soviet. G. Gratz: op. cit. Pp. 110-11.

His departure meant war: a war between East and West for Central Europe.

On the 7th a Bavarian Soviet was formed, but on the 16th the Roumanian offensive commenced, and while on the 18th the Vienna Revolution was suppressed, on the 30th the Roumanians arrived at the Tisza river. On 1st May, the great day of the Reds, when the whole capital was dressed in flowing red ribbons and papers, the Roumanians crossed the Tisza near Szolnok, and Miskolc was occupied by the Czechs, but on the 2nd the whole Proletariat was mobilised and the advance stopped.

The turn came for the Red Army, reinforced by the better elements, in order to save their lives, to liberate the Fatherland from the invaders and to destroy the Soviet.

Thus it happened that on the 18th May a Red offensive began against the Czechs, and on the 21st Miskolcz, on the 2nd June Érsekújvár and Léva in the North, Szerencs in North East, on the 6th Kassa, on the 9th Eperjes, on the 10th Bártfa were recaptured. The Czechs everywhere fled, or rather disappeared, until the advance of the Red Army was stopped by order Clémenceau on the river Vág and just before an invasion of both Austria and Bohemia could be effected.¹

But the Reds yearned for a decisive victory; on 20th July they turned against the Roumanians and crossed the Tisza.

The People's Commissioner, William Böhm who

¹ The military history of the Hungarian Soviet has been fully treated by Colonel J. Breit: *The Red War*. G. Gratz op. cit. Pp. 207-304.

since 21st April as generalissimo had led the campaign against the Czechs, was replaced by Eugene Landler, the chief of staff. Aurel Stromfeld, a Colonel of the Staff in the ancient Austro-Hungarian Army by Julier, another Lieutenant Colonel of the ancient Staff.

In four days the Reds arrived at the line of Szarvas-Karcag, but on the 24th a counter-offensive began, and on the 25th the order for a general retreat was given by Julier. On the 30th the Roumanians crossed the Tisza and on the 31st the Red Army collapsed. On the 1st August the commissioners fled in several trains to Austria; on the 2nd the last divisions were dissolved; on the 3rd the Roumanian troops approached, on the 4th at noon they entered the capital, Budapest, and the Hungarian Soviet came to an inglorious end.

140. From the first offensive of the Red Army Clémenceau had worked for an armistice

On the 24th June at Pozsony an agreement was made between the French General Mittelhauser and Commissioner Peter Ágoston for evacuation and on the 7th July the territory allotted to the Czechs was completely evacuated.

The Roumanians, who since the end of April had occupied territories to be left to the future Hungary, ignored the ultimatums sent on the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 14th, 23rd 25th August, 5th September, 12th October, and 3rd, 7th November by the Supreme Council from Paris to Bucarest. On the 4th August a Roumanian General appeared in Budapest and asked for a few day's repose for his fatigued soldiers, but when entering the town, Colonel Stromfeld asked „what about the agreement of non-occu-

pation?" and received the curt answer, *c'est mon affaire*.¹ It was not until the 14th November they left the capital; on the 25th their last train crossed the Tisza and not until the 31st March 1920 had they evacuated the present day Hungary.

The causes of their attitude lay deeper than might be supposed from the above-mentioned events.

Their attitude was a double game, and by that double game the hopes of the Roumanian Government were frustrated.

On the one hand, the Roumanians desired to occupy the whole of Hungary and thereby weaken the Hungarian nation as much as possible.

It was therefore a racial war which broke out between the great enemies, combined with a war between Bolshevist and regular armies — this latter aspect being the point of view by which the whole question was judged in the West. The Roumanians appeared well behaved and everywhere created hopes of liberation from the Reds, where ever Bolshevism ruled. Apart from Transylvania, where Bolshevism was unknown and where the racial war remained in its original form, the population was nowhere unfriendly to the regular troops, and owing to that goodwill they advanced as far as the Csorna-Balaton line in West Hungary.

The Roumanian troops however used the opportunity to destroy the vital forces of the future Hungary by committing damage amounting to an incredible sum. When the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers ordered an investigation into the matter it was substantiated that since the Padua

¹ G. Gratz op. cit. Page 303

Treaty the destruction of Hungarian property amounted to 30 milliard crowns in the then value of the Hungarian currency. As for the Roumanian occupation itself, the Supreme Council stated on the 8th August, that „*les Roumains violent les décisions de la Conférence et les droits élémentaires de l'humanité*“.¹

This attitude was contrary not only to justice and humanity; it was contrary even to the vital interest of both Roumania and the Roumanian people themselves.

In the great Slav programme worked out by the Czechs and the Serbs, and endorsed by their Russian protector, the two non-Slav peoples included were condemned to death and this was clearly understood in both Hungary and Roumania.

Louis Kossuth once said that if there were two peoples on earth who should go hand-in-hand because they are united by a common danger menacing the life of both, *these were the Hungarians and the Roumanians*. Count Tisza several times before and during the War, appealed in vain to the leaders of the Roumanians but Latin Roumania joined Russia, and on a certain Sunday night in August 1916 her troops crossed the Hungarian frontiers not only as enemies, but even as close allies of the Slavs.

When the great Slav programme was realised, it became necessary to build up the common defence of the non Slav nations, and in February 1919 the Hungarian envoy at Vienna, Oscar Charmant, was

¹ O. Charmant: *Mémoire du Gouvernement Hongrois à la Commission des Réparations* etc. Budapest 1922. Page 15.

despatched to Rome. On the 26th he found a warm reception at the Vatican and on the 27th at the Consulta; he was even received by the Premier Orlando on the 4th March, but when he returned his efforts were nullified by the Communism.¹

The turn now came to the Roumanians, but they failed to realise the importance of the question until they had plundered and left behind in disorder and misery the infortunate land which constituted their only possible ally against the Savs.

141. The Hungarians sought for help elsewhere.

After the fall of Count Károlyi's Government a committee was formed at Vienna by Count Stephen Bethlen, and Szeged was destined to be the starting point of national restoration.²

The first government was formed at Arad by Count Julius Károlyi; but it was later transferred to Szeged, where Count Paul Teleki represented the Vienna Committee.³

But the restoration was effected neither from Vienna, which lay outside Hungary, nor from Szeged, where the intended French interference was prohibited from Paris, but at Budapest.⁴

On the 1st August Béla Kun resigned and through

¹ Told by himself in his reminiscences published in the U. M. S. Vol. III. 1920. Pp. 1—7

² The Vienna Committee (Hung.). G. Gratz op. cit. Pp. 793—711.

³ Viscount J. Pallavicini: *Memoires of the Counter-Revolution*. U. M. S. Vol. I. 1920. Pp. 42—60.

⁴ For the French policy cf. D. Pázmándy: *Franco-Hungarian friendship*, K. N. Vol. XII. 1920. Pp. 9—7, and 47—55.

the mediation of the Entente Missions the Socialist Julius Peidl formed a Government.

This was the first sign that the neighbouring nations, fearing the restoration of the Hungarian Monarchy, had approached the Great Powers asking them to permit an exclusively Socialist government. The Great Powers assented, but on the 2nd August a counter-revolution broke out at Budapest, and the Socialist officials were all removed from their posts together with the Communists. It was agreed that until a National Assembly would be constituted, Archduke Joseph should act as Governor.¹

Therefore on the evening of the 4th Professor Jakob Bleyer was deputed to fetch the Archduke, but the railway station was already occupied by the Roumanians, who were aiming at the accomplishment of a personal Union between Hungary and Roumania. In these circumstances motor car was despatched to Alcsuth in the night and next morning the grandson of the last Palatine arrived safely to the Hotel Bristol.

On the same afternoon the Roumanian troops entered the streets of Budapest, guarded by the Reds, but while the Powers gave the Socialist Government the hopes of a quick recognition (a recognition denied to Hungary since the October Revolution) in the night time the Peidl Cabinet was arrested and a national Government was formed by Stephen Friedrich, which was duly recognized by the British and Italian missions.

By this restoration, Roumania was thrown back

For this part of the restoration cf. L. Kádár: The August revolution. U. M. S. Vol. II Pp 1 17

on her Slav allies and the mission of Minister Diamandi came to a sudden end.

On the other hand, however, the Archduke was also confronted with the Slav-Roumanian alliance and he was forced to resign the Governorship, because Sir George Russel Clerk, the Commissioner of the Powers, who arrived on the 23rd October, represented the point of view contrary to national restoration, a point of view dictated to him from Prague via Paris. At last on 22nd November Premier Friedrich was replaced by Charles Huszár, who formed a Coalition Cabinet, and on 23rd Sir George Clerk left in order to settle at Prague as Envoy of Great Britain.

From that day the fate of Hungary was dictated from Bohemia

The Missions rendered the Roumanian Occupation unnecessary. On the 14th they left, and on the 16th Admiral Horthy entered the Capital at the head of the national army formed at Siófok. On the 25th the Huszár Cabinet was recognized and the last Roumanian train crossed the Tisza river.

On 30th January the first elections held resulted in a Christian majority (76 Christians, 49 Farmers),¹ and the National Assembly inaugurated on 1st February formally elected on 1st March Admiral Horthy as Governor of the Hungarian Kingdom.

142 The duty of the Government and of the Natio-

That is to say, the members belonged to one or other of the so-called „Christian” political parties in opposition to the Socialists and Communists; there is therefore no implication that the „Farmers” were not also Christian as regards their religious faith

nal Assembly was to accept and sign the peace terms received from the Conference of Paris.

The delegates of Hungary were invited on 25th November 1919 to the Chateau de Madrid at Neuilly, and on 20th December a special delegation was formed, with Count Albert Apponyi as President. On 8th January 1920 the delegation arrived at Paris and was interned at the Chateau de Madrid.

It was now evident, that they had a difficult task before them and on the 15th at the Quai d'Orsay they received proposals identical with those of the note of 26th February 1919.

On 13th February, the Government protested but on 9th May the counterproposals were rejected by the Powers.. The covering letter of Millerand gave some ground for hope of the regulation of the frontiers being done on the spot, but that amounted to nothing, and it was even understood that the regulation would take place in favour of the partitioning states.

On 20th May Count Apponyi resigned¹, and on 4th June the Treaty was signed in the Trianon Palace by plenipotentiaries specially appointed for the occasion.

After signature the Czech, Serbs and Roumanian delegates rose and congratulated each other over the lacerated body of thousand-years-old Hungary bleeding under their rods and sentenced to death by the misinformed Western nations, ingrateful to the land to which they owe their own flourishing conditions

¹ Papers of the Delegation were published at Budapest in 1920—21 in four bulky volumes

And on that night hundreds and thousands of Hungarian mothers wept over their children in homes where it was not permitted to speak Magyar, and appealed to a God Who surely has other conceptions of Justice and Liberty.

History will record that these millions of unfortunate Magyars were transferred unasked, and against their will, and against both Law and Humanity, as the result of treaties concocted in secret sacrificing them to an inferior civilisation.

But in that matter history hands over the line of events to the great waves of human development. Sitting on their sandy shore we first look back with infinite sorrow to the dark clouds of the Past, so red with blood, so black with treachery, and then raise our saddened eyes to the bright star appearing in the blue firmament of the Future.

In our human weakness we feared lest the storm last for ever, yet in historical development it is after all but a moment of agony minute.

Hungary occupied her place long ere this mighty tempest arose that has wrecked nations and remodelled a Continent; she held that place not by the grace of treaties, but by virtue of her unique position in the scheme of Nature. And she will yet again hold that place; for to regard as absolute and final the dispositions of puny man were indeed the veriest vanity.

APPENDIX I.

List of the Kings and Palatines of Hungary, of the Princes and Governors of Transylvania, of the Bans of Croatia-Slavonia-Dalmatia, of the Governors of Fiume and of the Premiers of Hungary. 1660—1920.

1. Kings of Hungary.

Leopold I. . . .	2 April 1657 — 5 May 1705.
Joseph I. . . .	5 May 1705 — 17 April 1711.
Charles III. . . .	17 April 1711 — 20 October 1740
Maria Theresia	20 October 1740 — 29 November 1780.
Joseph II. . . .	29 November 1780 — 20 February 1790.
Leopold II. . . .	20 February 1790 — 1 March 1792.
Francis I. . . .	1 March 1792 — 2 March 1835.
Ferdinand V . . .	2 March 1835 — 2 December 1848
Francis Joseph	2 December 1848 — 30 November 1916.
Charles IV . . .	30 November 1916 — 1 April 1922

2. Palatines of Hungary.

Count Francis Wesselényi	1656—1667.
	1667—1681. <i>vacat.</i>
Prince Paul Esterházy	1681—1713.
Count Nicholas Pálffy	1714—1731.
	1731 — 1741. <i>vacat.</i>
Count John Pálffy	1774—1751.
Count Louis Batthyány	1751—1765.
	1765—1790. <i>vacat.</i>
Archduke Alexander	1790—1795.
Archduke Joseph	1795—1847.
Archduke Stephen	1847—1848.
	Since 1848— <i>vacat</i>

3. BARS OF CROATIA-SLAVONIA-DALMATIA.

Count Nicholas Zrinyi	1647—1664.
Count Peter Zrinyi	1664—1670.
Count Nicholas Erdődy	1670—1693.
Count Adam Batthyány	1693—1703.
Count John Pálffy	1704—1732.
Count John Drashkovitch	1732—1733.
Count Joseph Esterházy	1733—1741.
Count Charles Batthyány	1741—1756.
Count Francis Nádasdy	1756—1783.
Count Francis Esterházy	1783—1785.
Count Francis Balassa	1785—1790.
Count John Erdődy	1790—1806.
Count Ignatius Gyulay	1806—1831.
Francis Wlassich	1832—1840.
Count Francis Haller	1842—1845.
Bishop George Haulix lieut.	1845—1848.
Baron Joseph Jellachich	1848—1858.
Baron Joseph Sokchevitch lieut.	1858—1859.
Count John Coronini-Cronberg	1859—1860.
Baron Joseph Sokchevitch	1860—1867.
Baron Levin Rauch lieut.	1866—1871.
Koloman Bedekovitch	1871—1872.
Anton Vakanovitch	1872—1873.
Ivan Mazhuranitch	1873—1880.
Count Ladislas Pejachevitch	1880—1883.
Baron Hermann Ramberg lieut.	1883.
Count Charles Khuen-Hédervary	1883—1903.
Count Theodor Pejachevitch	1903—1907.
Alexander Rakodczay	1907—1908.
Baron Paul Rausch	1908—1910.
Nicholas Tomashitch	1910—1912.
Edward Cuvaj	1912.
	1912—1913. vacant.
Baron Ivan Skerletz	1913—1917.
Anthony Mihalovich	1917—1918.

4. Governors of Fiume.

Count Joseph Majláth	1779—1783.
Count Paul Almásy	1783—1788.
Count John Peter Szápáry	1788—1791.
Alexander Pásztory	1791—1801.
Joseph Klobusitzky	1801—1809.
	1809—1823. <i>vacat</i>
Francis Ürményi	1823—1837.
Paul Kiss de Nemeskér	1837—1848.
Count John Erdődy	1848.
	1848—1867. <i>vacat.</i>
Edward Cseh, Royal Commiss.	1867—1870.
Count Joseph Zichy	1870—1872.
Count Géza Szápáry	1872—1883.
Count August Zichy	1883—1892.
Count Louis Batthyány	1892—1898.
Count Ladislav Szápáry	1898—1904.
Baron Ervin Roszner	1904—1905.
Count Paul Szápáry	1905—1907.
Count Alexander Nákö	1907—1909.
	1909—1910. <i>vacat.</i>
Count Stephen Wickenburg	1910—1917.
Zoltán Jekelfalussy	1917—1918.

5. Princes of Transylvania.

John Kemény	1 January	20 November 1661.
Michael I. Apaffy	20 November 1661	— 15 April 1690.
Michael II. Apaffy	15 April 1690	— 31 December 1691.
Imre Thököly	15 September	— 25 October 1690.
Francis II. Rákóczi	6 July 1703	— 1 May 1711.

6. Governors of Transylvania.

Count George Bánffy	1692—1708.
Count Sigismund Kornis	1713—1731.
Count John Haller	1734—1756.
Count Ladislav Kemény	1758—1762.
Count Joseph Ausperg	1771—1773.
Baron Samuel Bruckenthal	1777—1787.

Count George Bánffy	1787—1822.
Baron John Jósika	1822—1834.
Count John Kornis	1837—1840.
Count Joseph Teleki	1841—1848.

7. Premiers of Hungary.

Count Julius Andrássy	1868—1871.
Count Melchior Lónyai	1871—1872.
Joseph Sziávy	1872—1874.
Stephen Bittó	1874—1875.
Baron Béla Wenckheim	1875.
Koloman Tisza	1875—1890.
Count Julius Szápáry	1890—1892.
Alexander Wekerle	1892—1895.
Baron Desider Bánffy	1895—1899.
Koloman Széll	1895—1903.
Count Charles Khuen-Hédervary	1903.
Count Stephen Tisza	1903—1905.
Baron Géza Fejerváry	1905—1906.
Alexander Wekerle	1906—1910.
Count Charles Khuen-Hédervary	1910—1912.
Ladislav Lukács	1912—1913.
Count Stephen Tisza	1913—1917.
Count Maurice Esterházy	1917.
Alexander Wekerle	1917—1918.
Count John Hadik	1918.
Count Michael Károlyi	1918 (31 October.)

8. The Revolution.

Head of the Republic: Count Michael Károlyi 1918—1919.
Premier: Dionys Berinkey. 18 January - 21 March 1919.

9. The Restoration.

Governors: Archduke Joseph, August 1919
Nicholas Horthy 1920.
Premiers: Stephen Friedrich 1919.
Charles Huszár 1919—1920.
A. Simonyi-Semadam 1920

APPENDIX II.

Sources and Literature

The history of Hungary has a rich literature, but it is chiefly published in Magyar, a language having no similarity with any one of those of the Western Nations.

This little bibliography is only a choice of the published sources and of the secondary works of importance, a weak resemblance of the great bulk of unpublished sources and even of published materials without which a close study of Hungarian history remains impossible.

1. Historical Bibliographies.

Hungarian Historical Literature (Magy.) Annual Supplement to the *Századok*, Vols. 1913—1917.

J. Szinngyel: Repertorium of the Periodical Literature relating to history (Magy.) 2 vols. Budapest 1874—1885.

2. Periodicals.

Magyar Történelmi Tár (Hungarian Historical Magazine). 25 vols. Budapest 1855—1878.

Történelmi Tár (Historical Magazine). 34 vols. Budapest 1878—1911.

Századok (Centuries. Review of the Hungarian Historical Society). Budapest 1867 et seq.

Hadtörténelmi Közlemények (Review for Military History) Budapest 1888 et seq.

3. Diplomataria.

Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Published by the Historical Section of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences Series I Diplomataria Budapest 1857 et seq. Series II

Scriptores. Budapest 1857 et seq. Series III. Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek (Transylvanian Parliamentary Debats, 1540—1699). 21 vols. Budapest 1875—98.

Török-magyarkori Történelmi Emlékek (Historical Monuments of the Period of the Turkish Invasion). Series I. Diplomataria. 9 vols. Budapest 1863—74. Series II. Török történetírók (Turkish historians). Budapest 1893 et seq.

G. Pray: Epistolae Procerum Regni Hungariae 1490—1711. 3 vols. Pozsony 1806.

4. General Works.

A) Sources.

Acta coniurationem Petri a Zrinio et Francisci de Frankopan, necnon Nadasdy illustrantia, 1663-71. Zagreb. 1888.

F. J. Miller: Epistolae archiepiscoporum Georgii et Pauli Széchenyi. 2 vols. Pest. 1807.

Veltzé: Die Hauptrelation des kaiserlichen Residenten in Konstantinopel, Simon Reningen, 1649—66. Vienna 1900.

B) Secondary Works.

J. Acsády: Mary Széchy (Countess of Wesselényi, 1610—79) Budapest 1885. (Hung.)

Count J. Andrássy: Nicholas Zrinyi. Budapest 1909. (Hung.)

D. Angyal: Imre Thoköly of Késmárk 1657—1705. 2 vols. Budapest 1888—89. (Hung.)

A. Károlyi: The suspension of the Constitution in 1673. Budapest 1883. (Hung.)

J. Pauler: The conjuration of Palatine Francis Wesselényi. 2 vols. Budapest 1876. (Hung.)

Ch. Széchy: Count Nicholas Zrinyi, 1620—64. 5 vols. Budapest 1896—1902. (Hung.)

5. Period 1681—1700.

A) Sources

S. Bubich: Reports of Frederico Cornaro, the Ambassador of Venice, and the capture of Buda in 1686. Budapest 1891.

B) Secondary Works.

A. Arneth: Prinz Eugen von Savoyen. 3 vols. Vienna 1858.

W. Fraknoi: Pope Innocent XI, and the liberation of Hungary. Budapest 1889. (Hung.)

A. Károlyi: The capture of Buda and Pest in 1686. Budapest 1886. (Hung.)

C. Maurer: Cardinal Leopold Graf Kolonits, Primas von Ungarn. Innsbruck 1887.

Merényi and Bubich: Palatine Prince Paul Esterházy, 1635—1713. Budapest 1895. (Hung.)

M. R. Popovitsch: Der Frieden von Karlowitz. Leipzig. 1893.

6. Period 1701—1715.

A) Sources.

Archivum Rákóczianum. Series I Military and Home Affairs. 10 vols. Budapest 1873—89. Series II. Foreign Affairs. 3 vols. Budapest 1871—77.

J. Fiedler: Actenstücke zur Geschichte Franz Rákóczi's und seiner Verbindungen mit den Auslande. 2 vols. Vienna 1855—58.

B) Secondary Works.

Baron L. Hengermüller: Hungary's fight for national existence or the history of the great uprising led by Francis Rákóczi II., 1703—11. Edinburgh 1913.

E. Horn: François Rákóczi, II Prince de Transylvanie, 1675—1735. Paris 1906.

A. Márki: Francis II Rákóczi, 1676—1735. 3 vols. Budapest. 1907—10. (Hung.)

7. Period 1715—1815.

A) Sources

W. Fred: Briefe der Kaiserin Maria Theresia 2 vols. München 1913.

B) Secondary Works.

A. Arneth: *Geschichte Maria Theresias*. 10 vols. Vienna, 1863—79.

Prince Broglie: *Mare Therese impératrice, 1717—80*. 2 vols. Paris 1892.

V. Concha: *Ideas of Reform in the Nineties (1790—92)*. Budapest 1888. (Hung.)

W. Fraknői: *Count Francis Széchenyi, 1754—1821*. Budapest 1903 (Hung.)

—: *The conspiracy of Martinovich and of his comrades*. Budapest 1880 (Hung.).

E. Guggia: *Maria Theresia, ihr Leben und ihre Regierung*. 2 vols. München 1917.

S. Kiss: *The last Insurrection of the Hungarian Nobility, 1809*. 2 vols. Budapest 1911. (Hung.)

H. Marczali: *Hungary in King Joseph II's times*. 3 vols. Budapest 1882—88. (Hung.)

H. Marczali: *Maria Theresia, 1717—1780*. Budapest 1891. (Hung.)

H. Marczali: *History of the Parliament of 1790—91*. 2 vols. Budapest 1907. (Hung.)

H. Marczali: *Hungary in the XVIIIth Century*. Cambridge 1910.

P. Mitrofanov: *Joseph II. seine politische und kulturelle Thätigkeit*. 2 vols. Vienna 1910.

E. Wertheimer: *Austria and Hungary in the first decade of the XIXth Century*. 2 vols. 1890—92. (Hung.)

E. Wertheimer: *The Parliament of 1811—12*. Budapest 1899. (Hung.)

8. Period 1815—1848.

A) Sources.

The Parliamentary Debats are all published separately (Lat.)

The works of Count Széchenyi, Louis Kossuth and Francis Deák also.

B) Secondary Works.

- S. Ferenczi: Francis Deák 3 vols. Budapest 1903. (Hung.)
S. Friedrich: Life of Count Stephen Széchenyi. 2 Vols. Budapest 1915—16. (Hung.)
S. Kardos: Life and Works of Baron Nicholas Wesselenyi. 2 vols. Budapest 1905 (Hung.)
L. Kovács: The last three years of the public life of Count Stephen Széchenyi. 1846—48. 2 vols. Budapest 1889. (Hung.)
M. Horváth: 25 years of Hungarian history. 1823—48. 2 vols. Geneva 1865. Second edition in 3 vols. Pest 1868. (Hung.)
A. Zichy: Count Stephen Széchenyi. 1790—1860. 2 vols. Budapest 1890. (Hung.)

9. Period 1848—1849.

A) Sources.

D. Pap: Diplomatarium relating to the history of the War of independence. 2 vols. Pest 1869 (Hung.)

B) General Works

- G. Gracza: History of the War of Independence. 5 vols. Budapest 1894—98. (Hung.)
J. Hermant: La révolution hongroise de 1848. Paris 1902.
M. Horváth: History of the War of Independence. 3 vols. Geneva 1865. Second edition Pest 1871. Third edition in 2 vols. Budapest 1881.
Irányi and Chassin: Histoire politique de la révolution de Hongrie. 1847—49. 2 vols. Paris 1859—60.
A. Pethő: Leading ideas of the War of Independence. Budapest 1916. (Hung.)

Government and Parliament.

A) Sources.

- Archiv des ungarischen Ministeriums und Landesverteidigungs-Ausschusses. 1848—49. 3 vols. Altenburg 1851.
D. Pap: The Parliament of 1848 at Pest. 2 vols. Pest

1866. Second edition. Budapest 1871.

D. Pap: The Parliament at Debrecen in 1848. 2 vols. Pest 1870.

B) *Secondary Works.*

Chiefly the General Works related above.

The Nationalities.

Die serbische Bewegung in Sudungarn. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der ungarischen Revolution. Berlin 1851.

M. Hartley: The man who saved Austria. The life and times of Baron Jellachich. London 1912.

B. Jancsó: Our War of Independence and the Daco-Roumanian Tendencies. Budapest 1895. (Hung.)

A. Pejakovich: Aktenstücke zur Geschichte des kroatisch-slavonischen Landtages und der nationalen Bewegung von Jahre 1848. Vienna 1861.

Foreign Relations.

A) *Sources*

Affairs of Hungary 1849—50. Message from the President of the United States, 3 April 1850, transmitting correspondence with A. Dudley Mann, 1849—50, relating to Affairs of Hungary, 61 st Congress, 2d Session State Documents 279, Washington 1910.

Correspondence relative to the affairs of Hungary, 1847—49. Presented both Houses of Parliament, August 15, 1849. London 1850

L. Szalay: Diplomatische Aktenstücke zur Beleuchtung der ungarischen Gesandtschaft in Deutschland Zurich 1849

B) *Secondary Works.*

W. Alter: Die auswärtige Politik der ungarischen Revolution, 1848—49. Berlin 1912.

Ch. Sproxtton: Palmerston and the Hungarian Revolution. Cambridge 1919.

Military history.

A) Sources.

Danzer: Dembinski in Ungarn, 2 vols. Vienna 1873.

A. Görgey: Mein Leben und Wirken in Ungarn in den Jahren 1848 und 1849. 2 vols. Leipzig 1852, English translation. London 1852.

G. Klapka: Memoiren, 1849. Leipzig 1850. English translation. London 1850.

H. Marczall: Count Charles Leiningen - Westerburg. Budapest 1900, English translation. London 1911.

B) Secondary Works.

J. Breit: Military history of the War of Independence, 1848—49. 3 vols. Budapest 1897—98. (Hung.)

W. Rüstow: Geschichte des ungarischen Insurrectionskrieges, 1848—49. 2 vols. Zürich 1860—61.

10. Period 1848—1860.

A) Sources

The Austrian Orders and Manifests.

B) Secondary Works

A. Berzeviczy: History of the Absolutism. Vol. I. 1848—52. Budapest, 1921. (Hung.)

H. Friedjung: Oesterreich 1848—1860 Vols I—II. 1. Vienna.

11. Period 1861—1871.

A) Sources.

Writings and Speeches of Francis Deák. The Parliamentary Debates are published separately.

B) Secondary Works

Count J. Andrassy: Der Ausgleich von 1867.

L. Eisenmann: Le compromis austro-hongrois de 1867. Paris 1904

E. Horn: Le compromis de 1868 entre la Hongrie et la Croatie et celui de 1867 entre l'Autriche et la Hongrie. Paris 1908.

12. Period 1871—1918.

A) Sources.

Speeches and Memoirs of Count Andrassy and Apponyi. The Parliamentary Debata are fully published in Hung.

B) Secondary Works.

A comprehensive history is not yet published.

On the Nationality Question the works appeared in French and English are chiefly Works of the anti-Hungarian Propaganda.

13. Period 1914—1920.

A) Sources.

The Papers of the Hungarian Peace Delegation were published in 4 vols. Budapest 1921

B) Secondary Works.

W. Fraknói. Die Ungarische Regierung und die Entstehung des Weltkrieges. Vienna 1919.

R. Gooss. Das Wiener Kabinett und die Entstehung des Weltkrieges. Vienna 1919.

G. Gratz: The Bolshevism in Hungary Budapest 1920. (Hung.)

Colonel F. Nyékhegyi. The Diaz Treaty (Hung.). Budapest 1922.

General Rubint. The collapse. Budapest 1922. (Hung.)

H. W. V. Temperley: History of the Peace Conference of Paris 6 vols. London 1920—21

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

ACP	<i>Acta coniurationem Petri a Zrinio et Francisci de Frankopan nec non Francisci Nádasdy illustrantia</i> , 1663—71. Zagreb 1888.
AE	<i>Akadémiai Értesítő</i> (Journal of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences). Budapest 1890 et seq.
AP	<i>E. Ashley: The Life of H. J. Temple, Viscount Palmerston</i> , 1846—65. 2 vols. London 1876.
AR	<i>Archivum Rákóczianum</i> etc. V. Appendix I.
AVSL	<i>Archiv des Vereins für siebenbürgische Landeskunde</i> , Nagyazeben 1853 et seq.
BG	<i>Wittichen and Salzer: Briefe von und an Friedrich von Gentz</i> . Vol. III. 1. Schriftwechsel mit Metternich 1803—19. München and Berlin 1913.
BSz	<i>Budapesti Szemle</i> (Budapest Review), Budapest 1858 et seq.
CMD	<i>Baron Conrad: Aus meiner Dienstzeit 1906—18</i> . Vol. I. Vienna 1921.
CN	<i>Correspondance de Napoléon</i> . 38 vols. Paris 1858—69.
DB	<i>Speeches of Francis Deak</i> . 6 vols. Budapest 1886—98.
EB	<i>Encyclopaedia Britannica</i> XIIIth edition. Cambridge 1910—11.
EOE	<i>Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek</i> (Transylvanian Parliamentary Records). Cf. Appendix I.
FRA	<i>Fontes Rerum Austriacarum</i> . Vienna 1849 et seq.
GEM	<i>A. Görgey: My Life and Acts in Hungary in the years 1848 and 1849</i> (Hung. edition.). 2 vols. Budapest 1911.

- GR *Gelchich and Thallóczy* Diplomatarum relationum reipublicae Ragusanae cum regno Hungarico. Budapest 1887.
- H *Hazánk* (Fatherland Review), Budapest 1884 et seq.
- KCP *Kerchelich*: De regnis Dalmatiae Croatiae et Slavoniae notitiae praeliminariae. Zagreb 1770.
- KHC *S. Katona*: Historia critica etc. Cf. Appendix I.
- KL Correspondence of Francis Kazinczy. (Hung.) 21 vols. Budapest 1890—1911.
- KM Works of Louis Kossuth 13 vols. Budapest 1880—1905.
- KN *Kelet népe* (People of the East Review), Budapest 1920 et seq.
- KW *S. Kardos*: Life and Works of Baron Nicholas Wesselényi. 2 vols. Budapest 1905.
- LMS *Ljetopis Matice Srpske*. Ujvidek 1825 et seq.
- LV Letters of Queen Victoria. 3 vols. London 1907.
- ME *H. Murczalt*: Enchiridion Fontium Historiae Hungarorum. Budapest 1901.
- MHR *E. Margallits*: Croatian Historical Repertorium. (Hung.) 2 vols. Budapest 1900—2.
- MJG *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*. Innsbruck. 1886 et seq.
- MCS *Magyar Gazdaságtörténelmi Szemle* (Review for Hungarian Economic History). Budapest 1895—99.
- MSM *Monumenta Spectantia historiam Slavorum Meridionalium*. Zagreb 1868 et seq.
- MTA *Magyar-török állományraktár* (Hungarian-Turkish Papers). 9 vols. Budapest 1863—74.
- MSTR *E. Margallits*: Serb Historia. Repertorium. (Hung.) Vol. I. Budapest 1918.
- NK *Niles*. Kalendarium manuale. Innsbruck 1885.
- NP *Aus Metternich's nachgelassenen Papieren*. 8 vols. Vienna 1880—84.
- P *J. Paluggay* *Partes Adnexae*. Historical and juridical relations of Croatia-Slavonia with Hungary. (Hung.) Pozsony 1863.

- PA** *S. Pejakovich*. Actenstücke zur Geschichte des kroatisch-slavonischen Landtags 1848. Vienna 1861.
- PE** *F. Pulszky*: My life and times. (Hung.) 4 vols. Budapest 1880—1882.
- PFH** *D. Pap*: Papers relative to the War of Independence. (Hung.) 1 vols.
- PH** *Pesti Hírlap* (Journal of Pest. Hung.) Pest 1841 et seq.
- PMN** *J. Pap*: The National Assembly of 1848. (Hung.) 2 vols. Pest 1866.
- RHD** *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*. Paris 1887 et seq.
- RJF** *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de la France*. Paris 1885 et seq.
- RMV** *Sammlung der für Ungarn erlassenen allerhöchsten Manifeste und Proclamationen*. 1850.
- SOM** *Staatsgrundgesetze der österreichischen Monarchie*. Wien 1861—68.
- SU** *Sammlung der für Ungarn erlassenen allerhöchsten Manifeste und Proclamationen*. 1850.
- SZ** *E. Sighart*: *Zolltrennung und Zollereinheit*. Vienna 1915.
- Sz** *Századok* (Centuries). Budapest 1867 et seq.
- SZS** *Ch. Szász*: *Sylloge tractatum aliorumque actorum publicorum*. Kolozsvár 1833.
- TGS** *F. Teutsch*: *Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen*. 3 vols. Nagyazeben, 1899—1910.
- TL** - *Történelmi Lapok* (Historical Journal). Kolozsvár 1874—76.
- TT** *Történelmi Társ* (Historical Magazine). Budapest 1878—1912.
- TTK** - *C. Tábori*: *Secret Police and Camarilla*. (Hung.) Budapest 1921.
- UJ** *Ungarische Jahrbücher*. Berlin 1921 et seq.
- UMSz** - *Uj Magyar Szemle* (New Hungarian Review.) Budapest 1920—1921.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS:

Chapter I. Formation of the Dual Monarchy, 1660—1815

I. Introduction	1
II. The national revival and its suppression, 1660—1681.	6
III. The Nationalities, a new factor in Hungarian Politics	16
IV. Liberation from the Turks and annexation by Austria, 1681—1700.	20
V. The first War of Independence and the first Compromise with Austria 1701—1715.	28
VI. The first Century of Dualism 1715—1815.	35

Chapter II. Reform of the Constitution, 1815—1848.

VII. Prince Metternich's Parliamentarism 1815—1832.	53
VIII. Prince Metternich and Russia 1815—1834.	60
IX. The Nationalities 1815—1832.	64
X. Crisis and Compromise with Austria 1832—1840.	68
XI. Struggle for the Majority, 1841—1848.	73
XII. The Revolution of 1848.	79

Chapter III. War of Independence and Compromise with Austria, 1848—1871.

XIII. Rising of the Nationalities, March August 1848.	82
XIV. The Austrian Intervention, September-October 1848.	101
XV. The Austrian Invasion, November 1848. February 1849.	110

231

XVI. The shadow of Russia, 1848—1849.	115
XVII. Liberation of Territory, March-May 1849.	118
XVIII. The Russian Invasion, 1849.	122
XIX. Absolutism, 1848—1860.	127
XX. The Compromise, 1861—1871.	137
<i>Chapter IV. Decline and Fall of the Dual Monarchy,</i> <i>1871—1920.</i>	
XXI. Strength and Weakness of the Dual System, 1871—1895.	148
XXII. Crisis of the Dual System, 1895—1918.	157
XXIII. Fall of the Dual System, 1911—1918.	169
XXIV. Partition of Hungary, 1915—1920.	182

APPENDIX I.

List of the Kings and Palatines of Hungary, of the Princes and Governors of Transylvania, of the Bans of Croatia-Slavonia-Dalmatia, of the Governors of Fiume and of the Premjers of Hungary. 1660—1920	215
--	-----

APPENDIX II.

Sources and Literature	219
List of Abbreviations	227
Contents	231

MS. A. 9. 2. 10. 11. 12.

1877

MS. A. 9. 2. 10. 11. 12.

South Eastern Library.

Vol. I Professor Eugene Horváth Phil.
D., Modern Hungary 1860-1920. Buda-
pest, 1922. Pagg. 232 Price in Hungary
500 Crowns in England 5 Shillings, in
the United States 1 Dollar.

Vol. II. Prof. John Lutter: A sketch
of Hungary's Past and Present (in the
Press)

M. T. d. Társulatok Szótárvallata Rt. Budapest V. II. Múzeum körút 4.

M. T. d. 7

60 80

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



32101 015610577

